





OXFORD: TRACT No. 90:

AND

WARD'S IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED TO

MEMBERS OF CONVOCATION.

WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING

THE TESTIMONIES OF TWENTY-FIVE PRELATES OF THE  
ENGLISH CHURCH;

EXTRACTS FROM WARD'S IDEAL;

CONDUCT OF MR. WARD COMPARED WITH THAT OF LUTHER;

AND THE RESOLUTIONS OF THE HEBDOMADAL BOARD.

BY

THE REV. W. SIMCOX BRICKNELL, M.A.

OF WORCESTER COLLEGE, INCUMBENT OF GROVE, BERKS,

AND ONE OF THE OXFORD CITY LECTURERS.

THIRD EDITION.

OXFORD,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY J. VINCENT;  
SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL; AND F. BAISLER, LONDON.

1844.

# THE JUDGMENT OF THE BISHOPS UPON TRACTARIAN THEOLOGY,

1837 TO 1842 INCLUSIVE.

The Editor of the above Work avails himself of the present opportunity to state, in reply to the numerous inquiries with which he has been favoured, that the Volume has been for some time in the press, and will appear as speedily as possible. It is hoped that the delay (occasioned by a variety of circumstances) will have tended only to render the Publication more complete as a volume of reference, and a record of the judgment of the Spiritual Rulers of the Church, at this momentous period of her history.

Meanwhile, it may be mentioned as a curious fact, illustrative of the degree of credit due to the statements of certain controversialists in the present day, that, long before a page of it was in the printer's hands, the Work in question was referred to by name (both of book and editor) in the columns of a Tractarian Journal, not merely as already published, but as having supplied the writer with proofs of an assertion which he was anxious to establish!

It may be well to add, in answer to misrepresentations which have been industriously circulated upon the subject, that not *a single word* has been omitted in any of the *Thirty-eight Charges* included in the volume, which bears, directly or indirectly, upon the Tractarian controversy.

W. S. B.

## ADVERTISEMENT TO THE THIRD EDITION.

---

WHILE the *first* edition of this pamphlet was passing through the press, it transpired that a Select Committee had been appointed by the Hebdomadal Board to examine and report upon MR. WARD'S *Ideal of a Christian Church*, with a view to ulterior proceedings on the part of the Academical Authorities.

On Saturday, November the 30th, MR. WARD was summoned before the Vice-Chancellor, attended by the Pro-Vice-Chancellors, the Proctors, and the Registrar of the University. The course which he thought proper to adopt, on that and a subsequent occasion, will be found, detailed by himself, in *Appendix III.*, and affords a very striking contrast to that of the illustrious individual whose character he has dared to malign, and whose principles he has so grossly misrepresented in the volume "which bears his name upon the title-page."

The last Meeting of the Hebdomadal Board upon this trying but most momentous question took place on Friday the 13th instant. The RESOLUTIONS then adopted are given in Appendix IV.

A *third* edition of this Pamphlet having been called for, I venture to hope that the statements contained in it, will be found to shew the *necessity* and *efficiency* of the MEASURES to be proposed to Convocation on the 13th of February next, no less than of the SUGGESTION in support of which they were originally put forth.

OXFORD, Dec. 19, 1844.



OXFORD: TRACT 90: AND MR. WARD'S  
IDEAL CHURCH.

“ *Quid agendum, non quid sentiendum.*”

IF “it ought not to be for nothing, no, nor for any thing short of some very vital truth, that persons of *name and influence* should venture on the part of ecclesiastical agitators,” the writer of the following pages would certainly be without excuse in attempting, under any less urgent pretext, to “intrude upon the peace of the contented, and alarm serious men.”<sup>a</sup>

All this, however, and much more than this, “is worth hazarding” where vital principles are at stake, where the purpose to be effected is the rejection of “*fatal error*,” and the accomplishment of a “*radical change*.”<sup>a</sup>

An “object thus momentous we believe to be” the removal of that stigma which at present rests on the University of Oxford, and bids fair to render her a by-word in the mouths of honest and honourable men of all ranks and professions in life.

<sup>a</sup> British Critic. July, 1841.





OXFORD: TRACT 90: AND MR. WARD'S  
IDEAL CHURCH.

“ *Quid agendum, non quid sentiendum.*”

IF “it ought not to be for nothing, no, nor for any thing short of some very vital truth, that persons of *name and influence* should venture on the part of ecclesiastical agitators,” the writer of the following pages would certainly be without excuse in attempting, under any less urgent pretext, to “intrude upon the peace of the contented, and alarm serious men.”<sup>a</sup>

All this, however, and much more than this, “is worth hazarding” where vital principles are at stake, where the purpose to be effected is the rejection of “*fatal error*,” and the accomplishment of a “*radical change*.”<sup>a</sup>

An “object thus momentous we believe to be” the removal of that stigma which at present rests on the University of Oxford, and bids fair to render her a by-word in the mouths of honest and honourable men of all ranks and professions in life.

<sup>a</sup> British Critic. July, 1841.

And surely it is full time that some effort should be made for the attainment of this object, when *Prelates of the highest station in the Church have formally communicated to the authorities of the University, their deliberate conviction that testimonials from Oxford must soon cease to be received as any security for the orthodoxy of the individuals to whom they are granted!* This is, indeed, “a moving thought:” we may well say of a University thus circumstanced, what MR. CHRISTIE says of a Church in which “*Gelibacy in the Clergy is not recognised as the rule,*” that “it must needs be in sackcloth, or if not, ought to be.”<sup>b</sup>

I venture, therefore, without further apology, to submit to the consideration of those most interested in the matter, a simple and practical Suggestion in reply to the question which I have adopted as a motto for the present address—“*Quid agendum, non quid sentiendum.*”

More than two years have elapsed since the BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR, speaking of the interpretation of the Articles, suggested by MR. NEWMAN in No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times, re-echoed the judgment of the HEBDOMADAL BOARD, and declared that the consequence of such an interpretation “must needs be” not only “perplexity and hesitation in fixing the

<sup>b</sup> Treatise on Virginitv, dedicated by Albany J. Christie, Esq., M.A., Fellow of Oriel College, “*In Honorem Beatissimæ et Gloriosissimæ semperque Virginis Mariæ!*” Preface, p. 29.

meaning of the Articles ;” not only “the evading and explaining away their real intention ;” not only “laxity of sentiment as to the importance of Unity of the Faith, and diversity and contrariety, instead of unanimity and concord,”—but the *co-existence of subscription to the Articles, with an inward belief of the very errors which the Articles themselves were framed to counteract !*”<sup>c</sup>

Whether BISHOP MANT, when he made this solemn avowal of his sentiments to the Clergy of his Diocese, was regarded as a “causeless alarmist,” is now a question of very little importance. Subsequent events soon proved that there was too much reason for believing him to be a true prophet ; and if the shadow of a doubt remained in the mind of the most sceptical, that doubt must be set at rest for ever by the startling fact so recently brought to light through the melancholy conversion of the REVEREND W. G. PENNY, M.A., Student of Christ Church, and Perpetual Curate of Ashenden, Bucks, the *eighth* Clergyman of the Church of England, and the *thirteenth* Member of the University of Oxford, known to have renounced the Protestant Faith, and to have joined the Church of Rome, within the last three years.

The fact to which I refer is this.—MR. JOLLIFFE, the brother-in-law of MR. PENNY, a member of a learned and honourable profession, a man of strict integrity and

• Charge of 1842, p. 12.

high-church principles, comes forward to defend his relative from a charge which, *as he was told*, had been brought against him,—the charge, namely, of having been for *years* a disaffected member of the English Church. Every one must admire the zeal of the advocate in hastening to clear the character of his friend from what *he* considered so serious an imputation upon his honesty and good faith. But it happened that, in rebutting a charge which had *not* been made, MR. JOLLIFFE inadvertently confirmed the truth of the real question at issue: MR. PENNY had been wavering in his allegiance to the Church of England, not for *years*, but for *months* ; this was the original accusation ; this, upon MR. JOLLIFFE'S own testimony, was the true state of the case. It was a question of time, and not of fact ; how long MR. PENNY had been meditating secession to the Church of Rome does not appear ; but for six months, at least, his allegiance had been divided, for “in May last,” according to MR. JOLLIFFE, he was in doubt as to the course he ought to take, though “he had *by no means determined* to go over.”<sup>d</sup>

MR. JOLLIFFE, too upright a man to attempt any *defence* of such conduct, though continued but for a few months, was naturally anxious to give his friend the benefit of the only *explanation* in his power. Whether he “*fears* more for the disciple than the teacher,” we are not informed ; it is quite evident which he *blames* most.

<sup>d</sup> See Mr. Jolliffe's Letter to the *Standard*.

We proceed, then, to the explanation of the important question, How came MR. PENNY to be a *Romanist* in *May*, and a *Student of Christ Church* in *October*?

“*He was advised by persons, whose opinions he had been accustomed to look up to with respect, that he could consistently hold his Livings, Studentship, and THEIR religious belief!*”<sup>e</sup> And who were his counsellors in this matter?—It is known that, among his particular friends and the members of his own college, he had recourse to DR. PUSEY. But he went further than this: I am not speaking at random when I assert that MR. PENNY disclosed his doubts to MR. NEWMAN, and that he received *from that gentleman* the solution mentioned by MR. JOLLIFFE. It was one of the very cases to meet which, the author of *Tract 90* had propounded “a system of interpretation so subtle, that by it the *Articles of our Church* may be made to mean any thing or nothing;”<sup>f</sup> and there appeared no reason why a *Studentship of Christ Church* should not be held by the same tenure as a *Fellowship of Oriel*.

I do not pretend to trace, with any certainty, the steps of MR. PENNY beyond the portals of ORIEL COLLEGE, or to describe the exact state of his mind after his interview with MR. NEWMAN. Let us suppose, however, that, with a conscience ill at ease, and doubts but partially removed, he bent his way to Broad-street, and

<sup>e</sup> See Mr. Jolliffe's Letter to the *Standard*.

<sup>f</sup> Charge of the Bishop of Oxford, 1842, p. 17.

passing hastily the spot which, for a moment, turned his thoughts to the English Reformation, betook himself to the rooms of a SENIOR FELLOW OF BALLIOL, whose boast it is that he “*regards that miserable event with deep and burning hatred!*”<sup>g</sup> MR. WARD was not at home; but there lay upon his table a ponderous volume, which opened readily at a particular place, as if to supply the absence of its author, and MR. PENNY read as follows:—

“That *Roman (sic)* sympathies and doctrines are making the most rapid strides among ‘high-churchmen,’ this no one, who has such experience as is accessible to myself, can for a moment doubt.”<sup>h</sup>

“Tendencies to Rome exist, and deeply do we deplore them. It is no longer possible to conceal them: it is treacherous to attempt to explain them away. We admit that they are increasing . . . . they are very important and very alarming; *they are deeply seated and widely spreading (sic)*. If we would retain some of our most devout and earnest members, who are *by hundreds (sic)* ‘straggling towards Rome’—some of *our most affectionate and warm-hearted, we do not say strongest-headed children,*——”<sup>i</sup>

MR. PENNY had not come to Balliol to learn the existence of *a tendency to Rome*; his eye glanced onward to the next page in search of something more “*necessary for his position,*”<sup>k</sup> and he read again:

<sup>g</sup> Ward’s Ideal of a Christian Church, p. 44.

<sup>h</sup> Ward’s Ideal of a Christian Church, p. 566.

<sup>i</sup> Christian Remembrancer, quoted by Mr. Ward, p. 566.

<sup>k</sup> Newman’s Retractation.

“As this process went on, our Formularies also assumed a new aspect, and it was at last discovered *how utterly lax and inoperative our Articles really are*. No secret has been made of this conviction. *It is now three years since I, a Clergyman of the English Church, writing in my own name, published an opinion, ‘that the Articles were not directed against those who retained the old Doctrines, (sic) so that they were willing to join in a protest against the shameful corruptions in existence, and also to give up the Pope,’ (Few More Words, p. 34, 35.) that ‘the Articles do not exclude’ the opinions which ‘had existed’ (sic) (at the time of the Reformation) ‘in the Church for an indefinite period.’ (sic) (Appendix to ditto, p. 8.) No argument has appeared of any force against these positions ; and, what is more to the purpose, NO CONDEMNATION OF THEM BY ANY AUTHORITATIVE TRIBUNAL.*

“THREE YEARS HAVE PASSED, SINCE I SAID PLAINLY, THAT IN SUBSCRIBING THE ARTICLES I RENOUNCE NO ONE ROMAN DOCTRINE: YET I RETAIN MY FELLOWSHIP WHICH I HOLD ON THE TENURE OF SUBSCRIPTION, AND HAVE RECEIVED NO ECCLESIASTICAL CENSURE IN ANY SHAPE.”<sup>1</sup>

MR. PENNY closed the volume and returned. He had gained at least the knowledge of this astounding fact, that there *are* men who *do* hold Protestant preferment with Romanist opinions, and not only so, but *teach others to do the same!* He had seen them with his own eyes, and heard them with his own ears, and had been himself one of their disciples.

But neither the *vivâ voce* counsels of MR. NEWMAN, nor the *littera scripta* of MR. WARD, nor the instructions which he received elsewhere, could satisfy MR.

<sup>1</sup> Ward's Ideal of a Christian Church, p. 567.

PENNY that what those men did was *right*. He saw through the “*erudite quibbles*”<sup>m</sup> of No. 90: its “*flagrant misrepresentations*,” its “*dishonest casuistry*,” its “*shifting, evasive, disingenuous sophistry*”<sup>n</sup> could not make *him* “content to be in bondage,” or “work in chains,” or “go on teaching with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies, and inconsistent precedents, and principles but partially developed.”<sup>o</sup>

The result is too well known. MR. PENNY hesitated for a time, but eventually followed MR. TICKELL, as Mr. Tickell had followed MR. BURTON; and Mr. Burton, MR. MURRAY; and Mr. Murray, MR. KING; and Mr. King, MR. LOCKHART; and Mr. Lockhart, MR. TALBOT; and Mr. Talbot, MR. SEAGER; and Mr. Seager, MR. PARSONS; and Mr. Parsons, MR. RENOUF; and Mr. Renouf, MR. DOUGLAS; and Mr. Douglas, MR. GRANT; and Mr. Grant, MR. SMITH; and Mr. Smith, MR. WACKERBATH; and Mr. Wackerbath, MR. SIBTHORPE; and Mr. Sibthorpe, MR. BIDEN!<sup>p</sup>

But the Teachers still remain:<sup>q</sup> the ranks of their disciples are replenished with fresh supplies, and the

<sup>m</sup> Count Montalembert's Letter to the Rev. J. M. Neale, of the Cambridge Camden Society.

<sup>n</sup> Charge of the Bishop of Ossory, Ferns, and Leighlin, 1842, pp. 287. 171. 193.

<sup>o</sup> Tract No. 90, p. 4, 1st edit.

<sup>p</sup> Other names might have been added to this melancholy catalogue, viz. MR. GOOCH, A BOY AT SHREWSBURY SCHOOL, MISS ELLIOTT, MISS YOUNG, MISS — YOUNG, MISS RUSSELL, MISS GLADSTONE, MRS. SEAGER.

<sup>q</sup> I trust that this expression will not be construed into a wish that the Teachers may follow the example of their Disciples, and apostatize to Rome. “RESIGNATION AND LAY COMMUNION” was long since held out by themselves as their only alternative, and it is still open for their adoption.



evil goes on without a check. The prophecy of BISHOP MANT has been verified to the letter; *the co-existence of Subscription to the Articles with an inward belief of the very errors which the Articles themselves were framed to counteract,*" is a phenomenon in morality which may excite astonishment, and grief, and indignation, but can no longer admit of doubt.

"*You may consistently hold your Livings and Studentships with OUR religious belief.*" This is the doctrine of MR. NEWMAN and his Party, and they teach it both by precept and example; it is the language of their daily life and conversation!

"You may maintain that the change which takes place in the 'creatures of bread and wine,' in the Holy Eucharist, is '*a greater miracle*' than was 'the strange and awful change of the element of water into wine,' at 'Cana of Galilee :'<sup>r</sup>—From 'the gifts promised to the Apostles after the Resurrection,' you may inculcate '*the present influence and power of the Mother of God* :'<sup>s</sup>—you may urge upon your hearers the duty of 'never omitting to pray, at the end of their meditation, *for the holy souls in Purgatory* ;'<sup>t</sup> and remind them that '*to be ashamed of devotion to the Blessed Saints, or to the Relics of their earthly tabernacles, or to Holy Images, is to be ashamed of the Cross of Christ* :'<sup>u</sup>—you may denounce 'the English Reformation' as '*the very embodiment of the sins most opposed to the*

<sup>r</sup> Newman's Sermons on Subjects of the Day, p. 43.

<sup>t</sup> Ward's Ideal of a Christian Church, p. 356.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid, p. 43.

<sup>u</sup> Ibid, p. 274.

*all-important principles of Dutifulness and Faith ;*<sup>v</sup> and feel ‘ *the most intense abhorrence,*’<sup>x</sup> a ‘ *deep and burning hatred of that miserable event ;*’<sup>y</sup>—you may hold it up to obloquy and contempt, as ‘ *a movement,*’ than which ‘ *none so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard*’ has ever taken place ‘ *in the Church, except Arianism in the fourth century ;*’<sup>z</sup>—you may ‘ regard the Roman Church with *affection and reverence,*’<sup>a</sup> and ‘ pursue such a line of conduct as’ may cause you in the end to ‘ *be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of divine wisdom and authority*’ that exist in *her*,<sup>b</sup> while ‘ the *English Church* is . . . *yet wholly destitute of external notes, and wholly indefensible, as to her position, by external, historical, ecclesiastical arguments :*’<sup>c</sup>—you may ‘ *repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her*’ (the Roman) ‘ *Communion, and sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration :*’<sup>d</sup>—you may ‘ assail with the most rabid violence of language’<sup>e</sup> the Protestant Doctrine of ‘ Justification by Faith alone,’ (‘ the very phrase invented by Luther for his *heresy,*’ and ‘ incorporated’ into our 12th Article<sup>f</sup>) as ‘ *radically and fundamentally monstrous, immoral, heretical, and anti-Christian,*’<sup>g</sup>—‘ *a hateful and fearful type of Anti-christ,*’<sup>h</sup>—in its abstract nature and necessary ten-

<sup>v</sup> Ward’s Ideal of a Christian Church, p. 99.

<sup>x</sup> Ibid. p. 587.

<sup>y</sup> Ibid. p. 44.

<sup>z</sup> Ibid. p. 45. note.

<sup>a</sup> Ibid. p. 100.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. p. 473.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. p. 286.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. p. 286.

<sup>e</sup> Charge of the Bishop of Ossory, 1842. p. 189. 3rd edit.

<sup>f</sup> Ward’s Ideal, p. 479.

<sup>g</sup> British Critic, No. 62, p. 446.

<sup>h</sup> Ward’s Ideal, p. 305.

dency ‘*sinking below Atheism itself*:’<sup>i</sup>—you may do all this, for ‘*all this has been done*,’<sup>k</sup> and is doing by men who yet ‘consistently’ retain Fellowships in a Protestant University, Preferment in a Protestant Church, and—‘THEIR religious belief!’ In a word, you may ‘subscribe’ the Articles ‘in a *non-natural* sense,’ you may persuade yourselves that their ‘*natural meaning may be explained away*,’<sup>l</sup> (for *we ourselves have so* subscribed, and *do so* explain them,<sup>l</sup>) and yet conscientiously declare that you subscribe them ‘*willingly and ex animo*,’ in the sense in which your subscription is required by those who impose it”!

How many adherents of the Tractarian Party may be, at the present moment, under the influence of teaching such as this;—how many are thus “halting between two opinions,” vainly striving, with a divided allegiance, to “serve two masters,” it is impossible for man to say. *I know myself of one such instance;—an Undergraduate of some promise, now ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς, waiting only Mr. Newman’s signal; regarding with implicit reverence “the belief and practice of that most eminent living name in English Theology, and Dr. Pusey’s most intimate friend;”<sup>m</sup> content to stay while he stays, and to depart when he sees fit!*

That there are *many* such cases is now admitted

<sup>i</sup> Ward’s Ideal, p. 587.

<sup>k</sup> British Critic, July, 1841.

<sup>l</sup> Ward’s Ideal, p. 479.

<sup>m</sup> See a Letter to the Editor of the *Times*, from the REV. THOMAS WILLIAM ALLIES, M.A., Rector of Launton, Oxon, and “*A Late Fellow of Wadham College*.”

upon all hands :<sup>n</sup> but the danger has been so forcibly depicted by one whose former position in the University, and present station in the Church, must secure for what he says both attention and respect, that I shall briefly state it in his own words.

“ Of the evils of Sectarian Enthusiasm we have had abundant proof; and they may now be held up as a beacon light, guarding against an approach to *that more seductive*, and I may add *more fatal danger* to which *these rash teachers are exposing the younger members of our Church*.

“ They seem to think it enough, here and there to protest against certain Popish corruptions; but *they love to lead their disciples to the very confines of that treacherous ground,—study to make its boundaries less distinct and perceptible, and seem intent upon smoothing the way, and affording facilities for passing on from our own side to the other*.

<sup>n</sup> While writing these words, the *English Churchman* of yesterday (Nov. 14) has reached me. I transcribe, from one of its leading articles, the following very important and instructive passage. After referring to a late report, that Mr. Newman had openly avowed the impossibility of his continuing any longer in the English Church, the Editor proceeds,—

“ In spite of the recent calumny,—being no better than a calumny,—it would, we think, be idle to conceal, either from ourselves or from others, that the Church of England *seems (sic)* at least, to have a much looser hold than formerly on the hearts of some of the very choicest of her children. To confine ourselves to the most important case of this sort, *there can be few, even of his most ardent admirers, who are not watching the course of MR. NEWMAN (sic) with some anxiety, not only as regards himself, but in reference to the probable consequences to our Communion of his quitting her, should he ever feel impelled to do so.* . . . . So many minds have been formed by him, so many are, humanly speaking, indebted to him for peace in their present position, that were he ever to withdraw from us, *we are sure that the effect would be considerable disturbance; several, doubtless, would accompany him; others would begin to doubt the reality of the views into which they had been led, and greater violence in the wrong direction might proceed from high quarters.*”

“IF THIS BE NOT DANGEROUS TO THE PURITY OF OUR CHURCH, AND OF THE FAITH WHICH HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED AMONG US BY THE BLOOD OF MARTYRS, IT IS HARD TO SAY WHAT IS; AND IF IT BE RECONCILABLE WITH THAT ALLEGIANCE TO WHICH ALL HER MEMBERS HAVE OVER AND OVER PLEDGED THEMSELVES, THEN HAVE WE CLEANSED OUR SANCTUARY IN VAIN.”<sup>o</sup>

I come now to the *Practical Suggestion*, which it is my immediate object most respectfully, but earnestly, to submit to the attention of Convocation.

A very general impression prevails, at the present moment, among members of the University, that MR. WARD'S Treatise on *The Ideal of a Christian Church* cannot long be suffered to remain without some formal and authoritative censure. How imperatively such a step is called for must, I think, be manifest to any person as yet unacquainted with that “most audacious”<sup>p</sup> volume, from the series of extracts appended to this pamphlet, all of which have been carefully printed from the original work.

But whatever course may be adopted with reference to Mr. WARD, I must venture, with all due deference, to express my conviction, that to condemn the *Ideal Church*, and leave Mr. NEWMAN'S *system of inter-*

<sup>o</sup> Charge of the BISHOP OF LLANDAFF, 1842, pp. 27, 28.

<sup>p</sup> The strong epithet used by the BISHOP OF OSSORY, in speaking of the *Catechism* published a short time since by the REV. W. U. RICHARDS, Curate to the REV. F. OAKELEY, of *St. Margaret's Chapel, Marylebone*,—suppressed by the BISHOP OF LONDON, and subsequently reprinted in Oxford by MR. WARD, in an altered but not much less objectionable form,—will be found but too applicable in the present instance.

*preting the Thirty-Nine Articles* where it is, would be to act like the incurious husbandman, who contents himself with mowing down the summer produce of some noxious perennial, while he leaves the roots established firmly in his field, to grow and multiply *under ground*, and to produce in each succeeding year, a more abundant harvest of toil and trouble. The evil requires a more searching and vigorous remedy, and without it we shall look in vain for a cure.

I suggest, therefore, that *A Memorial be presented to the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses, requesting that Convocation may be assembled for the express purpose of solemnly repudiating the pernicious system of interpretation propounded in the Ninetieth Number of the Tracts for the Times ; and, at the same time, of recording the formal censure of the University upon MR. WARD'S Ideal of a Christian Church.*

That such a measure would be as efficient as it is practicable, I trust I shall be enabled to shew before I conclude. Let me, however, in the first instance, endeavour to remove an objection which may, possibly, be urged against it.

It will be said, that TRACT 90 has been condemned already.—Certainly such an opinion does prevail to a very considerable extent ; and I hope that I should be the last person in the world to overlook the obligations under which the Church and the University were laid by the *Resolution* of the Members of the HEBDOMADAL BOARD, in March, 1841. They discharged their duty

to the full extent of the powers which they possessed ; “ they *seemed* to have in view certain dangers ; ” <sup>a</sup> they “ *appeared* ” <sup>a</sup> to meet those dangers with an energy and a decision which could scarcely be misunderstood. More than this, their judgment “ *seems* ” <sup>a</sup> to have been confirmed and applauded by every Prelate of our Church who has hitherto alluded to the subject. Not fewer than *twenty-four* Bishops “ *seem* ” <sup>a</sup> to have agreed upon the case ; their verdict “ *appears* at least ” to have been unanimous ; to have approached as nearly as any thing well can do to the “ *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus :* ”—yet, on the other hand, it must not be forgotten, that there are persons who “ *seem* ” inclined to believe that their Lordships, “ amid their many duties, manifestly had not leisure to examine, as a whole, the teaching upon which they had to speak ; ” <sup>a</sup> that they formed their “ views from insulated statements,” <sup>a</sup> and “ their warnings from detached passages,” <sup>a</sup> “ not thinking it necessary to enter into the whole subject,” <sup>a</sup> “ prevented,” in some cases, “ from acquainting themselves with the real meaning of the points on which they spoke ; ” <sup>a</sup> and therefore putting forth “ admonitions *which sound like* condemnation, but which are known not to be founded on any thorough understanding of the views condemned.” <sup>a</sup>

But, putting *appearances* out of the question, the *fact* is not to be denied that, in spite of the *Resolution*

<sup>a</sup> See DR. PUSEY'S *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, pp. 47, 48. 83. 97. 143, and the writings of the Tractarians, *passim*.

of the HEBDOMADAL BOARD, the evil which it was designed to remedy has not only continued and increased, but has been followed to a most alarming extent by the very consequences foretold by those who, at the time, were looked upon as “causeless alarmists,” and “unbidden accusers of the Brethren.” In a word, to use the expression applied by MR. WARD to the Formularies and Articles of our Church, the *Resolution* of 1841 has proved “*utterly lax and inoperative* ;”<sup>r</sup> and I hope I shall not appear too presumptuous if I add—(still adopting the language of MR. WARD *as far as I can conscientiously follow him*)—“It is now three years since I, a Clergyman of the English Church, writing in my own name, published an opinion that”<sup>s</sup>—the events which had *even then* transpired fully proved the necessity of submitting the important question which agitated the University to the deliberate judgment of *Convocation*.<sup>t</sup>

It must be almost needless to observe that the leading Members of the Party against whom the *Resolution* of the HEBDOMADAL BOARD was directed, have denied its authority from the very first.<sup>u</sup>

<sup>r</sup> Ward's Ideal Church, p. 567.

<sup>s</sup> Ibid. p. 567.

<sup>t</sup> Resignation and Lay Communion, p. 31.

<sup>u</sup> In justice to MR. SEWELL, it should be stated, that *he* recognised the *Resolution* as proceeding from “the appointed Guardians of the Statutes, bound, in the words of the Statute-Book itself, ‘de Statutis observandis tractare, deliberare, et consilia inire ;’” and as put forth in “the mode usually adopted by the Board, in calling the attention of the junior members of the University to the observance or violation of any particular Statute.”—*Letter of Professor Sewell to Dr. Pusey*, P.S., pp. 2, 3.



It had not even been promulgated when DR. HOOK, forgetting his "*Call to Union*,"<sup>v</sup> "nailed his colours to the mast,"<sup>x</sup> and declared himself "*a Party-man*."<sup>y</sup>

"The moment I heard that MR. NEWMAN was to be silenced, not by argument, but by *usurped authority*, that moment I determined to renounce my intention of pointing out in Tract 90 what I considered to be its errors: that moment I determined *to take my stand with MR. NEWMAN*; because, though I did not approve of a particular Tract, yet in general principles, *in the very principle advocated in that Tract*, I DID AGREE WITH HIM: in a word, I was compelled by circumstances to act as a *Party-man*. And in justice to one whom I am proud to call my friend, *I am bound to say that Mr. Newman's explanatory Letter to Dr. Jelf, is to my mind, perfectly satisfactory*."<sup>z</sup>

"The Church of England is now a divided body . . . . THE MOST UNHAPPY DETERMINATION of the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford to censure MR. NEWMAN,—A CENSURE WHICH I HAVE LITTLE DOUBT THE CONVOCA-TION OF THE UNIVERSITY WOULD, IF SUM-MONED, REVERSE,—has proclaimed this from one end of the country to the other."<sup>a</sup>

<sup>v</sup> See some very just observations upon DR. HOOK's conduct by an unexceptionable witness, the REV. F. D. MAURICE, Professor of English Literature in King's College, in his "*Reasons for not joining a Party in the Church*," addressed to ARCHDEACON SAMUEL WILBERFORCE, 1841.

<sup>x</sup> Speech of DR. HOOK at a meeting of the Leeds District Committee of the Society for the *Propagation of the Gospel*!—March 31, 1841.

<sup>y</sup> DR. HOOK's Letter to the Bishop of Ripon, p. 6.

<sup>z</sup> It will be seen, by reference to the Episcopal Testimonies appended to this Pamphlet, that MR. NEWMAN's *Explanatory Letter* is quoted by DR. HOOK's "own Diocesan" to shew that, in his opinion, "*the integrity of Subscription is endangered*."

*Letter to the Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Ripon.* By WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., Vicar of Leeds, pp. 4—6.

Whether the VICAR OF LEEDS “ere he proceeded”<sup>b</sup> to make the foregoing declaration, had “weighed well the merits”<sup>b</sup> of the case, is more than I undertake to determine ;<sup>c</sup> certain it is that, on the present occasion at least,<sup>d</sup> he *took the lead* of his friends ; no less certain is it that *they* did not forsake *him* in the hour of need, or leave him to fight alone. DR. HOOK’S attack upon the *Board of Heads of Houses* was vigorously followed up by MR. KEBLE, DR. PUSEY, MR. WARD, MR. OAKELEY, MR. PERCEVAL, and others of less note. MR. KEBLE maintained that their *Resolution* was “*not an act of the University*,”<sup>e</sup> and that it “*laid no definite obligation on the consciences of those in inferior station*.”<sup>e</sup> “It was a consoling,”—

<sup>b</sup> “No doubt the present controversy will induce him” (DR. SYMONS,) “to weigh well the merits of each question which may be brought before him, ere he proceeds to act.”—DR. HOOK’S *Letter to a Friend at Oxford*, October 4, 1844.

<sup>c</sup> MR. MAURICE, in the Letter already referred to, is of opinion that the “excuse of a hasty pamphlet, ought hardly to be pleaded respecting a *Letter to a Bishop* ;” and therefore “fears” that DR. HOOK “must intend to retract the sentiments contained in his Sermon.”—*Reasons for not joining a Party*. pp. 10, 11.

<sup>d</sup> “Deeply deploring that you should, upon grounds wholly mistaken, have attempted by a printed circular to check the opposition at a period when it is impossible to vindicate the grounds upon which we act, we venture to hope that you will retract an allegation which appears to us to be a great injustice to those who concur in that opposition.”—*Answer to DR. HOOK’S Letter to a Friend in Oxford*, October 5, 1844. The *English Churchman* of Oct. 10, speaking, among other “untoward events,” of “DR. HOOK’S *unfortunate Letter*,” and the “*adroit fiction of identifying the opposition to DR. SYMONS with MR. WARD’S Book*,” states that “the imputation has been since withdrawn :” I am not aware, however, that DR. HOOK’S retraction has been made public.

<sup>e</sup> KEBLE’S *Letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge*, p. 12.

MR. KEBLE “trusted he might say, a *providential* circumstance, that NO AUTHORITATIVE CENSURE HAD YET BEEN PASSED.”<sup>f</sup>

The consequence is natural enough, though it “may well perplex simple minds.”<sup>g</sup> The *Ninetieth Number* of the *Tracts for the Times* still continues the textbook of the Tractarian School, and the cause of all the mischief that has ensued. The mode of interpretation condemned by the HEBDOMADAL BOARD, in their “grave and well-considered document,”<sup>h</sup> is pronounced by MR. KEBLE, to be the “*true, legitimate, Catholic exposition of the Articles*,”<sup>i</sup>—such as cannot well cease to exist, while men have eyes to read the Fathers and to compare them with the Articles, and hearts to feel the duty of Catholicity :”<sup>k</sup>—it is maintained by DR. PUSEY as not only an admissible, but *the most legitimate interpretation* of them :”<sup>l</sup> while MR. WARD, as we have already seen, avails himself of the same plea to glory in his shame, and boasts that he “*still retains his Fellowship on the tenure of subscription, and renounces no one Roman doctrine*”!!<sup>m</sup>

The efficiency of the plan which I have ventured to suggest may appear, perhaps, to some persons, not a little questionable, after the conduct already detailed.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid, pp. 12, 13.

<sup>g</sup> Charge of the BISHOP OF OSSORY, p. 196. “Tract No 90, shewed, indeed, how they might, if they pleased, remain in the Church, how much soever of the belief of Rome they had embraced; but it does not explain why they should choose to do so.” Ibid. p. 195.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. p. 183.

<sup>i</sup> Keble’s Letter, p. 7.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. p. 34, 35.

<sup>l</sup> Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 148.

<sup>m</sup> Ward’s Ideal, p. 563.

What grounds are there, it may be asked, for supposing that the Tractarians will pay to the *Judgment of CONVOCATION* that deference which they have refused to the *Resolution* of the HEBDOMADAL BOARD? Upon this point, however, the testimony of MR. KEBLE is so plain and so decisive, that I shall content myself with replying to the question in his own words.

“ Suppose that not the *Heads of Houses*, but the ACADEMICAL BODY IN CONVOCATION ASSEMBLED, had determined that interpretations such as have been now (not for the first time) suggested, evade, rather than explain the Articles, and are inconsistent with the duty of receiving and teaching them in good faith, to which the University, by express statute, binds her tutors and other members; how would a COLLEGE TUTOR (to take the simplest case first) have to act under such circumstances, supposing him convinced that the condemned view is the right one? *Would it not be a plain breach of a human trust, if he used the authority committed to him for the purpose of teaching that view? and of a still higher trust, if, in compliance with the Academical law, he forbore to inculcate it?* ”<sup>a</sup>

“ Instances enough have been given to make it clear, that, HAD THE CENSURE UNHAPPILY BEEN AUTHORITATIVE, it would have been no slight stumbling-block in the way of Academical TUTORs, who might, on other grounds, think it their duty so to interpret ambiguous phrases in the Articles as to bring them most nearly into conformity with the pri-

<sup>a</sup> *The Case of Catholic Subscription to the 39 Articles considered: with especial reference to the duties and difficulties of English Catholics at the present Crisis. In a Letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge. By the REV. JOHN KEBLE, M.A., 1841. p. 13.*

mitive Church, and to throw no unnecessary censure on other Churches.

“Such persons would have been *met at every turn by the recorded sentence of the University against them*: in them it would have been no contumacy, *but plain conscientiousness, to withdraw from an engagement which they could not religiously fulfil.*”<sup>o</sup>

“And there is yet a deeper consideration: they may, perhaps, think that College tuition is a branch of the pastoral care; at least, if they be themselves ordained to serve at God’s altar, and then they *will have no further alternative; they must either teach Catholicism, or not teach at all.*”<sup>p</sup>

“To pass from the case of those engaged in tuition, (which is, also, *mutatis mutandis*, the case of those who appoint the University Tutors:) *it would be matter of grave inquiry, whether ANY PERSON, adhering to the Articles in the sense pointed out by the Tract, could, with an unblemished conscience, become a Member of the University, or even, without dispensation, continue such.*”<sup>q</sup>

“If there be no reason to the contrary, the natural meaning of the words, as at first drawn up, may be taken without hesitation as the meaning of the Church, or State, or University, calling on us to sign them. Still our *obligation (sic)* so to take them, comes from *our relation to the imposers*, not the compilers; or, as MR. NEWMAN has most concisely worded it, ‘*We have no duties toward their framers.*’”<sup>r</sup>

“‘The sense of the *imposers*’ can only mean, ‘*the sense in which they intended to allow subscription:*’ plain and obvious, where the words of the Formulary admit but of

<sup>o</sup> *The Case*, &c. p. 16.

<sup>p</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>q</sup> *Ibid.* p. 17.

<sup>r</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 18, 19.

one interpretation: in other cases, doubtful at first reading, yet capable of being fixed with any degree of certainty, by comparison of different passages; by the declarations of the parties; or, *as in the case now supposed, by AN AUTHORITY RULE OF EXPOSITION SUPERADDED TO THE ORIGINAL FORMULA.*"<sup>s</sup>

"But all this depends on *the consent, implied or expressed, of the party imposing subscription.* LET THAT BE ONCE UNEQUIVOCALLY WITHDRAWN, and *we shall indeed be liable to the taunts and reproaches which now affect us so little, were we to go on subscribing by virtue of our Catholic interpretation.*

"I would not willingly excite unnecessary scruples, nor cast a stumbling-block in the way of any man's conscience; but is it not so, that HAD CONVOCATION RATIFIED ANYTHING EQUIVALENT TO THE RECENT VOTE OF HEADS OF HOUSES, not only *Tutors*, holding the Catholic view of the Articles, *must have resigned their offices to avoid breach of trust*, but *no Academic whatever, of the like principles, could either subscribe afresh, or continue his subscription?* Obviously he could not subscribe, for he could not do so in any sense allowed by the imposers.

"But since most of those who subscribe the Articles in the Universities, are too young to have definite opinions on their meaning, the main import of their subscription being, that they receive them on the authority of the present Church: this might be thought no very great evil in practice. Few, it may be thought, would be excluded by it; and those who did subscribe, would have greater security (so this argument would suppose) for sound education.

"But what are those to do who have subscribed long ago in the *Catholic sense*, now (by hypothesis) forbidden? *Can they honestly go on availing themselves of their former signa-*

<sup>s</sup> *The Case*, p. 20.

ture, now that the consideration is at an end which made that signature available? Can they, with clear and untroubled consciences, receive the emoluments of an Academical foundation, or exercise the privileges of a member of the Academical Senate, while deliberately breaking the condition on which only they were allowed to share in those advantages? As long as they do so, they seem virtually to continue, or renew their act of adhesion to the formula; and if there would be insincerity in that act, were it now to be performed for the first time, surely to go on reaping the benefit of it, amounts to a constant repetition of the insincerity.

"I am not prepared to say, that under such circumstances, individuals might not honestly go on, *having sufficient reason to know such was the wish of the imposing body in their own particular case*: but if not sin, it would approach nearly to scandal, *unless they could obtain a public dispensation, express or implied, to that effect*. But as to the general case, as far as I see my way in it, *I own that I have no alternative*: it would be equivalent to the University's adopting a new test, which, if you cannot take, *you can but retire from the Society*."†

Such, then, is the course to which, upon their own acknowledgment, MR. KEBLE and his friends stand committed should a decision of the SENATUS ACADEMICUS confirm the *Resolution* of the HEBDOMADAL BOARD, and solemnly repudiate the system of interpretation suggested in TRACT 90. Against this alteration, painful as, on many accounts, it must be, CONVOCATION has to weigh the formidable and increasing danger which now threatens the University. On which side the balance will preponderate, it cannot, surely, be difficult to foresee.

† The Case, &c., pp. 24, 25.

But be the course adopted by the Party what it may, Members of Convocation have a duty to perform, a duty which they owe not to themselves only, or to their children, but to the Church to which they belong, and the Country in which they live. And,

“ I do hope that Masters will calmly and dispassionately consider the matter over, and bethink themselves of it as a very serious question, whether, having power delegated to them by the Sovereign Disposer of all things, they can, without great wrongness of mind, neglect to use it when a case . . . which has stirred the indignation of the country at large, comes under their jurisdiction. . . . A Christian politician must deal with men as with immortal souls, and till men do so, they will never have that root of love which inwardly distinguishes the most zealous opposition to men who are supposed to be wrong, from that contentiousness of the worldling, which may be like it in its outward development, and in that only.”<sup>u</sup>

To this exhortation from the pen of an opponent, let me once more add the forcible appeal of the MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, quoted on a former and somewhat similar occasion, and to which the painful experience of the last three years has attached a still higher degree of interest and importance.

*“ Should a persevering adherence to their views of Subscription fail to be met by a corresponding vigilance on the part of the Church herself; should any ill-timed spirit of forbearance, or compromise, or indifference, silently allow her tests to be rendered null and void, by forced and evasive interpretations, till at length it might be plausibly urged that*

<sup>u</sup> Letter from N. E. S. (The Rev. John Brande Morris, M.A., of Exeter College) to the English Churchman, June, 1844. *Fas est ab hoste doceri.*



*the, so-called, Catholic sense was at least one of the senses notoriously recognised by those who imposed subscription, then would our case be hopeless indeed.* What could then remain to stem the returning tide of error and corruption, against which, by the good providence of God, our Articles have hitherto been found an insurmountable barrier and defence? Far better would it be to seek for Christian unity in the wide field of Scripture itself, (with what prospect of success we can all readily anticipate,) than continue to affect the mere semblance of unity, by a hollow and delusive subscription to Articles thus become a dead letter and a disgrace. Under such unhappy circumstances, to say that they were utterly void of use, would be the least of their condemnation. They would be infinitely worse than useless. To the sincerely attached friends of our Reformed and Protestant Faith, they would be an afflicting memorial of past blessings and present degradation; to the clear in intellect and the upright in heart, they would be an object of loathing and disgust; to the weak and wavering, a deadly snare; a cloak for hypocrisy, an encouragement to sin.”<sup>v</sup>

That the step now submitted to the notice of CONVOCA-  
TION is as *practicable* as, with the Divine blessing, it would be efficient, can scarcely be questioned by any one who considers the demonstration of feeling so lately exhibited at the nomination of the Vice-Chancellor, and remembers that the “*Resolution*” of the

<sup>v</sup> *The Thirty-nine Articles considered as a Standard and Test of the Doctrines of the Church of England, chiefly with reference to the views of No. 9<sup>th</sup>, of the Tracts for the Times.* A Lecture, delivered before the University of Oxford, in the Divinity School, on Thursday, June 3, 1841, by GODFREY FAUSSETT, D.D., the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, and Canon of Christ Church.—pp. 43, 44.

HEBDOMADAL BOARD, in 1841, was, in a great measure, attributable to the zealous exertions of only *four* individuals.\*

Is it too much to suppose that, with as little trouble, and without any *secret* canvass,<sup>y</sup> *as many hundreds* might now be found eager to embrace the opportunity presented to them, of vindicating the honour of the University, and discharging a duty which cannot longer be postponed, but at the hazard of “*very vital truth*”?

Let every member of Convocation, who may take the trouble to read these remarks, weigh well the recorded Judgment of the Bishops of our Church upon the character and tendency of TRACT 90: let him learn, in the melancholy catalogue of *Secessions to the Church of Rome*, how “utterly inoperative” the principles of that Tract have proved—how inadequate for the purpose they were designed to answer:

\* The REV. T. T. CHURTON, M.A., Vice-Principal and Tutor of Brasenose College.

The REV. H. B. WILSON, B.D., Fellow and Senior Tutor of St. John's College.

The REV. JOHN GRIFFITHS, M.A., Sub-Warden and Tutor of Wadham College.

The REV. A. C. TAIT, M.A., Fellow and Senior Tutor of Balliol College.

<sup>y</sup> It is well known that the recent opposition to the appointment of DR. SYMONS as VICE-CHANCELLOR was got up, in a great measure, under the secret assurance, that more than a hundred individuals had already enrolled themselves among the conspirators. No such underhanded method has been adopted in the present instance: the suggestion now openly submitted to the consideration of Members of Convocation rests simply on its own merits; and, if approved, would doubtless be carried into effect, with all the moderation, energy, and zeal displayed upon the occasion to which I have just referred.

let him witness the effect which they produce where they *are* recognised and developed, in the conduct of MR. WARD, and the unmitigated Popery of his IDEAL CHURCH: and then, remembering that such is the state of things in OXFORD, let him ask himself whether the *quid agendum* be not a topic worthy of his immediate and most serious attention?

If he feel the urgency of the case,—is satisfied that *something* must be done,—and has no SUGGESTION *more* PRACTICAL to offer, let him act as if the success of the plan proposed, depended, under God, solely upon his own exertions; not content with *thinking* how important the result might be if it could but be accomplished—“whatsoever his hand findeth to do, let him *do* it with ALL HIS MIGHT.”

## APPENDIX.

- I. THE JUDGMENT OF THE BISHOPS OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH  
UPON THE CHARACTER AND TENDENCY OF TRACT 90.
- II. EXTRACTS FROM WARD'S IDEAL CHURCH.
- III. CONDUCT OF MR. WARD BEFORE THE HEBDOMADAL  
BOARD, COMPARED WITH THAT OF LUTHER BEFORE THE  
DIET OF WORMS.
- IV. RESOLUTIONS OF THE HEBDOMADAL BOARD, IN THE CASE OF  
MR. WARD'S "IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH CON-  
SIDERED, ETC."

## I.

### TRACT 90.

ABSTRACT OF THE JUDGMENT OF THE BISHOPS OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND, SO FAR AS IT HAS BEEN HITHERTO DELIVERED.

---

“If all our Prelates should severally declare, *ex cathedra*, their adhesion to the view which has just been expressed at Oxford;<sup>a</sup> or if not all, yet *such a majority*, as to leave no reasonable doubt what the decision of a Synod would be. In such a case, would it not be incumbent on those who abide by the Catholic exposition, yet wished to retain their ministry, to protest in some such way, as that the very silence of our Bishops permitting them to go on, would amount to a virtual dispensation as regarded them?

“More especially, if the Bishop under whom we ourselves minister, did, in any way, lay on us his commands to the same effect: (as a public official declaration of his opinion would amount to a virtual command, and ought, I imagine, to be obeyed as such :) these are considerations, which would make our position a very delicate one indeed.”—KEBLE’S *Letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge*, pp. 27, 28.

---

#### I. BERESFORD, ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH.—1841.

“An attempt to reconcile the plain language and specific object of our Articles with the general and ambiguous principles laid down in the decrees of the Council of Trent, from which the corruptions in Faith and Practice in the Romish Church have arisen, and under colour of which they still prevail.”

<sup>a</sup> *At a Meeting of the Vice-Chancellor, Heads of Houses, and Proctors, in the Delegates’ Room, March 15th, 1841.*

Resolved, That the modes of interpretation, such as are suggested in the said Tract, evading rather than explaining the sense of the Thirty-nine Articles, and reconciling subscription to them, with the adoption of errors, which they were designed to counteract, defeat the object, and are inconsistent with the due observance of the above-mentioned Statutes.

P. WYNTER,  
Vice-Chancellor.

## II. WHATELY, ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.—1841.

“But neither the Reformers of our Church, nor any other human being, could frame any expressions such as not to admit of being explained away, or the consequences of them somehow evaded, by an ingenious person who should resolutely set himself to the task.”

## III. SUMNER, BISHOP OF CHESTER.—1841.

“If I rightly apprehend the argument here, a Clergyman may preach or teach what manifestly contradicts the ‘true, usual, literal meaning’ of the Articles, if he thinks he can support his doctrines by the teaching of the Church Catholic.”

## IV. MALTBY, BISHOP OF DURHAM.—1841.

“An elaborate attempt . . . to explain away the real meaning of our Articles, and infuse into them a more kindly spirit of accommodation to the opinions and practices of the Church of Rome.”

## V. MONK, BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER AND BRISTOL.—1841.

“The ostensible object of this Tract is to shew, that a person adopting the Doctrines of the Council of Trent, with the single exception of the Pope’s Supremacy, might sincerely and conscientiously sign the Articles of the Church of England. But the real object at which the writer seems to be labouring, is to prove that the differences in Doctrines which separate the Churches of England and Rome will, upon examination, vanish. Upon this point, much ingenuity, and, I am forced to add, much sophistry is exerted.”

## VI.—LONGLEY, BISHOP OF RIPON.—1841.

“When I find it asserted, that ‘the Articles are to be received, not in the sense of the framers, but (as far as the wording will admit, or any ambiguity requires it), in the one Catholic sense,’<sup>b</sup> the integrity of Subscription appears to be endangered.”

<sup>b</sup> Mr. Newman’s Letter to Dr. Jelf in *explanation* of Tract 90, p. 24.

## VII. SUMNER, BISHOP OF WINCHESTER.—1841.

“ Interpretations of our Articles, at variance with what has been generally received as the intentions of the compilers, and inconsistent with the Royal Declaration, ‘ that no man . . . shall put his own sense or comment to be the meaning.’ ”

## VIII. WILSON, BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.—1842.

“ One of the most dishonourable efforts of sophistry, which, I must say, has ever been witnessed in theological discussions.”

## IX. MANT, BISHOP OF DOWN AND CONNOR, AND DROMORE.—1842.

“ A process for ascertaining the truth, the very contrary to that which our Church has prescribed. . . . The consequence of which must needs be . . . the co-existence of Subscription to the Articles with an inward belief of the very errors which the Articles themselves were framed to counteract.”

## X. PHILLPOTTS, BISHOP OF EXETER.—1842.

“ The tone of the Tract, as it regards our own Church, is offensive and indecent; as it regards the Reformation and our Reformers, absurd, as well as incongruous and unjust. Its principles of interpreting our Articles I cannot but deem most unsound; the reasoning with which it supports its principles, sophistical; the averments on which it founds its reasoning, at variance with recorded facts.”

“ A procedure as uncatholic and schismatical as can well be imagined.”

“ As this is by far the most daring attempt ever yet made by a Minister of the Church of England, to neutralize the distinctive Doctrines of our Church, and to make us symbolize with Rome, I shall be excused if I detain you

for a few minutes in unravelling the web of sophistry, which has been laboriously woven to cover it."

XI. MUSGRAVE, BISHOP OF HEREFORD.—1842.

An effort "by uncandid and tortuous criticism, by intricate and subtile explanation, to reconcile the notions referred to with the meaning of the Church, which is so obviously to the contrary."

XII. COPLESTON, BISHOP OF LLANDAFF.—1842.

"Loose and disingenuous doctrine . . . . A dishonest course, tending to corrupt the conscience, and to destroy all confidence between man and man . . . . A want of principle which ought to exclude" the subscriber, "not only from sacred functions, but from every office of important trust. . . . I doubt not but that your own voice would join with mine in reprobating such dangerous subtleties."

XIII. BLOMFIELD, BISHOP OF LONDON.—1842.

"A ground of no unreasonable alarm to those, whose bounden duty it is to 'banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines;' and, therefore, to guard against the insinuation into our Church of any one of those false opinions which she has once solemnly repudiated."

XIV. O'BRIEN, BISHOP OF OSSORY, FERNS, AND LEIGHLIN.—  
1842.

"Throughout the whole Tract . . . . the dishonest casuistry to which the Jesuits have given a name, is employed upon a scale to which it would be hard to find a parallel, except in the more notorious of their own writings."

"I should despair of conveying any thing like a full impression of the shifting, evasive, and disingenuous sophistry with which the purpose of the Tract is followed out."

"A mode of escape from the fair force of the most solemn and sacred obligations,—by such sophistry and evasion,



such shifts and contrivances, as a man could not apply to the very lightest of the engagements of common life, without forfeiting all reputation for integrity and good faith."

XV. BAGOT, BISHOP OF OXFORD.—1842.

"A system of interpretation, which is so subtle, that by it the Articles may be made to mean any thing or nothing."

XVI. DENISON, BISHOP OF SALISBURY.—1842.

"The disapproval expressed of the mode in which these topics were handled in the Ninetieth Number of the *Tracts for the Times* was, as you are aware, the immediate cause of the termination of that work: and I believe that the soundest and wisest members of our Church rejoiced . . . that the Bishop of Oxford interposed as he did on that occasion. . . ."

XVII. THIRLWALL, BISHOP OF ST. DAVID'S.—1842.

"The character of the Church required that such a mode of interpreting her Formularies should be publicly discountenanced."

XVIII. BETHEL, BISHOP OF BANGOR.—1843.

"The tendency of this Tract is to draw persons whose minds are going astray in the direction of Rome, still nearer to her, by palliating the evils of her Doctrine and practice, and cutting from under our feet that ground of necessity, and of an imperious sense of obligation on which our Reformation is based."

XIX. PONSONBY, BISHOP OF DERRY.—1843.

"It becomes your duty . . . to guard the inestimable treasure which, in her Articles . . . our Church has handed down to us, from false interpolations."

## XX. AUSTIN, BISHOP OF GUIANA.—1843.

“I view the principle attempted to be established” in Tract 90, “as opposed to the very foundation on which the Anglican Church rests. . . There is, I believe, but one opinion among sound Churchmen, namely, that it has a most dangerous tendency.”

## XXI. KAYE, BISHOP OF LINCOLN.—1843.

“Where there are real essential differences of Doctrine, there to attempt to explain them away by subtile and refined interpretations, appears to me a proceeding inconsistent with religious sincerity, and calculated to deaden the perception of truth in the mind, both of him who puts forth such interpretations, and of them to whom they are addressed.”

“What will be the ultimate result of the course pursued by the learned author of the Tract in question, remains to be seen.”

## XXII. SPENCER, BISHOP OF MADRAS.—1843.

“I would record my solemn protest against all in their writings that I believe to be erroneous, . . . and first and foremost, against any new interpretation or partial remoulding of our Articles.”

“It is the unquestionable duty of every Clergyman, laying aside all curious search, to take each Article in the literal and grammatical sense of the words; and whenever any tampering with them shall be admitted, it is but too probable that the time of a general apostacy from the truth will not be far distant.”

## XXIII. MURRAY, BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.—1843.

“In the latter of which,” (Tract 90) “the Articles of our Church are wrested from their plain meaning, to mitigate and soften down the condemnation which is there attached to certain Doctrines of the Church of Rome.”

## XXIV. BROUGHTON, BISHOP OF AUSTRALIA.—1844.

“There is still less probability, I hope, of our admitting any principle of Interpretation which shall put upon our Articles a sense but slightly, if at all opposed to those very persuasions which, by their plain construction, and the known intentions of their framers, we have hitherto been led to believe they were specially intended to contradict and refute. It is impossible to tell how far the adoption of such a principle might carry us. It was first applied, I think, in an instance which has since been much discussed: that is the question of Purgatory. I really am at a loss to understand how any one, who is superior to subterfuge, could subscribe the Article,’ (Twenty-second) “and yet believe that he might, at the same time, hold the Decrees of the Council” (of Trent).

## XXV. ALLEN, BISHOP OF ELY.—1844.

The Bishop of Ely has given, within the last few days, a practical proof of his sentiments upon Tract 90, by refusing *even to admit for examination* as a Candidate for Holy Orders, a Graduate of Queen’s College, Oxford, known to interpret the Thirty-nine Articles according to the method suggested by Mr. Newman.

II.

EXTRACTS FROM

THE IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH

CONSIDERED IN COMPARISON WITH EXISTING PRACTICE.\*

BY THE REV. W. G. WARD M.A.,  
Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford. 1844.

---

A "volume . . . distinguished for its abhorrence of every shred of Protestantism—for deep sympathy with the Roman Church—for disgust and loathing at the present condition, theoretical and practical, of the Establishment. But of all its distinguishing features, we confess we can find none more eminent than this—the extraordinary capacity of the Author for standing upright and balancing himself on an invisible point—for walking in perfect security upon a line, compared with which the edge of the keenest razor is breadth unlimited."—THE TABLET. *Romish Newspaper*. Vol. v. No. 220.

---

I.

MR. WARD ANTICIPATES "ELUCIDATIONS OF HIS TEACHING."

"I am well aware that there are several passages in the following pages, which admit of being extracted and circulated with great promise of success: but I would beg to urge on the attention of those who might be inclined to such a course, that all who circulate extracts from a work, incur the responsibility of implying, that such extracts give a *fair and just idea* of its general contents. I here then enter my protest, that no series of extracts will, in my opinion, convey this fair and just idea, if they do not include such passages, as that in p. 81, beginning, 'And I will say plainly <sup>b</sup>——' "—*Preface*, p. vii.

\* The following Extracts are printed exactly as they stand in the original.

<sup>b</sup> See the passage in question in Sect. IX.

## II.

## MR. WARD'S FEELINGS AND POSITION.—MR. FROUDE'S REMAINS.

“Still an objection has been taken to the *tone* in which my humble yet zealous protests have been made. A word has been used in a private communication, which I have not seen in print, but which, I suppose, expresses the sort of feeling: it has been said, then, that they appear couched not in sorrowful but in ‘spiteful’ terms. I think I perceive what that element is in them, which has given rise to such a feeling; and I humbly trust that it is neither wrong nor unbecoming.”

“In the first place, most certainly it does not shew that, what appear to me the corruptions in question give me no pain. For years, consciously or not, and in various shapes not recognised by me at the time as modifications of the same symptoms, had my feelings been oppressed and (I may really say) tortured, by this heavy, unspiritual, unelastic, prosaic, unfeeling, unmeaning Protestant spirit. All this time my ears were stunned with the din of self-laudation, with the words ‘pure and apostolical,’ ‘evangelical truth and apostolical order,’ and the like most miserable watch-words; those, from whom I learned at one moment some high and elevating truth, at the next crushed and overwhelmed me by some respectful mention of our existing system: with the single exception of Mr. FROUDE’s work, no external response could I find to my ceaseless and ever-increasing inward repugnance, against the habits of thought and action prevalent in our Church. At length I was able to fix, with some definiteness, on the particular cause of my annoyance: soon afterwards (in writing two pamphlets three years ago) I had the opportunity of speaking out.”<sup>b</sup>

<sup>b</sup> The Pamphlets to which Mr. Ward refers are—1. *A Few Words in support of Tract 90.* 2. *A Few More Words in support of Tract 90.*

“Certainly, so far is it from being the case, that the idea of corruptions within our Church was a congenial idea to my own mind, that I suffered innumerable troubles and perplexities, before it ever occurred to me to seek for their cause in its true quarter; the radically corrupt and heretical nature of the system which I had been taught.” p. 75.

### III.

#### THE CHURCH OF ROME AND THE ENGLISH REFORMATION.

“When we consider how signally and conspicuously the English Reformation transgressed those great principles,<sup>c</sup> (more so indeed than any other event on a similar scale in the history of the world,) one part of the reason will be seen, for the deep and burning hatred, with which some Members of our Church (including myself) regard that miserable event.” p. 44.

“It will be seen, then, that I cannot at all agree with those who prefer the English Reformation to the Foreign; so far from it, I know no single movement in the Church, except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard, as the English Reformation. I am not here expressing any judgment on individual Reformers, but on certain plain and acknowledged facts; nor am I at all denying (nor yet maintaining) that the course of events here has been divinely overruled to less disastrous results than among the Foreign Protestants.” p. 45, note.

“And the same considerations render it equally impossible to refrain from the most earnest and almost indignant disavowals of the language, adopted by many

<sup>c</sup> “The one, *the absolute supremacy of conscience in moral and religious questions*; the other, *the high sacredness of hereditary religion.*”

‘high-churchmen’ towards Rome. A small, very small, knot of individuals, in using such language, intend only to attack certain modern developments of doctrine, which they consider corruptions; but with the general body the case is very far different. ‘High-churchmen’ of the present day are not in general (nor have any need to be) subtle and accurate theologians: in attacking Rome, they attack not this or that particular, but a certain general spirit, to which Rome has ever most prominently and honourably witnessed; that very spirit of which I spoke above. It is a mere theory, refuted by the smallest practical experience, to suppose that these peculiarly Christian tempers of mind can ever be held in due honour and reverence, I do not say by a very few individuals, but by any numerous class, while such language towards Rome, as that to which I allude receives encouragement or indeed tolerance. Nor in like manner can the all-important principles of dutifulness and faith be apprehended in their true colours, so long as it is supposed to be an acknowledged fact, that the English Reformation (which to me appears the very embodiment of the sins most opposed to those principles) is to be regarded with respect.” pp. 98, 99.

“Let Mr. Wilson exercise his judgment on a Pope’s bull, and characterize it as almost worthy of a ‘railing’ censure; but let others have equal liberty, and with no greater remonstrance, to honour St. Mary as the highest and purest of creatures; to regard the Roman Church with affection and reverence; and to hold a Pope’s dogmatic decree as at least exempt from our criticism and comment.” pp. 99, 100.

“If ‘high-church’ principles be really substantive and distinct, what possible danger can there be in heartily and ungrudgingly carrying them forward to their results? and if they be not substantive, who could grieve that this

fact should be established by means of a fair trial? For my own part, I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction,—that were we, as a Church, to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so, we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine wisdom and authority in the Roman Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration.” pp. 472, 473.

See also in Sect. IV. V. and VI.

#### IV.

##### PRESENT STATE AND POSITION OF THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

“ And to speak plainly, believing as I most firmly do, that ever since the schism of the sixteenth century, the English Church has been swayed by a spirit of arrogance, self-contentment, and self-complacency, resembling rather an absolute infatuation than the imbecility of ordinary pride, which has stifled her energies, crippled her resources, frustrated all the efforts of her most faithful children to raise her from her existing degradation, I for one, however humble my position, will not be responsible for uttering one word, or implying one opinion, which shall tend to foster this outrageous delusion. The disease has been too deeply seated to yield to ordinary remedies : experience has shewn that mere hints and implications, *especially when united with disclaimers of superior admiration for other systems*, have wholly failed in their objects : and even had the British Critic during its two last years performed no other service, it has at least succeeded in this ; in impressing on the most careless and inobservant minds this fact, that



certain members of the Church of England, be they more or fewer, do raise their voices in indignant protest against the system and spirit which so extensively energize within her, and do wish to raise the sympathies of her many holy and devoted children to some higher object, than the maintenance and praise of that system." p. 55.

"Whether or no indeed the English Church *does* give such helps towards the most ordinary Christian life, as frail and humble believers seek at her hands, is a question which will come under our consideration in a future chapter: but unless she does so, though the character she held up for reverence and imitation were really the true evangelical pattern; though she encouraged her children to honour austerity, celibacy, voluntary poverty, as much as she in fact (practically at least, and in her authoritative teaching) encourages them to despise or revile those graces; even then, there would not be so much as an approach to a proof, that she even tolerably fulfils the very primary object, for which the Church was founded; nor would her children have any reason for withholding their most bitter complaints, if they meet not at her hands with that protection and support, which shall shield them from the implacable enemies of their salvation." pp. 76, 77.

"I will only add, that it has often struck me, as one conceivable reason for that inscrutable dispensation of Providence, whereby the English Church is placed in her present most anomalous condition, gifted with the power of dispensing sacramental grace, and yet wholly destitute of external notes, and wholly indefensible, as to her position, by external, historical, ecclesiastical arguments; one purpose, I say, designed by this may be, that the whole Church may have her mind attracted to those all-important truths, to which I drew so particular attention in the second

chapter, and which there seemed great danger of many among her members forgetting ;—the absolute supremacy of conscience ;—and the high sacredness of hereditary religion.” p. 286.

“ And I beg in all sincerity and humility to repeat what I said some way back. When I feel called on to use strong language about the corruption of our own Church, or the sinfulness of the Reformation, or similar matters, I really am not at all conscious of being influenced either by desire of eccentricity, or by a spirit of undutifulness. The words I use do not even fully express the convictions that are among the very deepest I feel. And I use them, that I may, at fit time and place, bear my witness against those opinions on the subject of English purity and Roman corruption, which seem to me not only *not* innocent and amiable mistakes, but among the greatest snares and temptations which lie in our path.” p. 293.

“ In that chapter I implied, as my deep conviction, that this fundamental principle of ordinary ‘ high-church ’ theology, considered in the temper of mind to which it fitly appertains, is simply Anti-Christian, and considered in its inevitable tendency, is destructive of all religious belief whatever.” pp. 117.

“ Who can wonder at the small degree of favour which God seems to have shewn to the Anglican ‘ high-church ’ principle, when it has its very origin and life in this appalling blasphemy.” p. 428.

“ To be lukewarm, to be insensible of her own corruptions, to be loud in her own praise, are the notes given in Scripture of that Church, which our Blessed Lord will ‘ spue out of his mouth ’ (Rev. iii. 16, 17) ; to retain the

Faith, and be zealous against doctrinal error (Rev. ii. 6, 13), as redeeming features even in the midst of many corruptions. What is His judgment of our Church's practical system? a system under which she tolerates almost every variety of condemned and branded heresy; and under which her authorities seem really offended and disgusted at one only class of opinions, those which speak of her present condition as corrupt and almost apostate. The closest approximation to denial of our Lord is permitted, as I have shewn, without protest, much more without condemnation; but an imputation on *herself* she cannot forgive." p. 429.

*The following are among the contents of Chap. VI.*

"Sect. 4.—Our Church's total neglect of her Duties as guardian of, and witness to, morality. Sect. 5.—Our Church's total neglect of her Duties as witness and teacher of orthodoxy."<sup>d</sup>

See also in Sect. II.

## V.

### PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

"Unless, before it be too late, the unhappy victim feel the misery of his case, abandon with terror and with anathema private judgment, that great principle of the Reformation, and cling *in faith* to his early creed, that once more by prayer and obedience he may learn to know and realize the presence of God,—unless he be so favoured, what awaits him, except a gloomy and cheerless scepticism, and the indescribable misery of sinking farther, day by day, first from good habits, and next from good desires." p. 504.

See also under Sect. VI.

<sup>d</sup> It is to be hoped that she will speedily vindicate herself from *this* aspersion.

## VI.

## JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

“Under the second head we must class those tendencies (of various kinds) which led to the invention and defence of Luther’s Doctrine of Justification. No one can suspect me of underrating the extreme sinfulness of that most hateful heresy, or if so, the fifth chapter of the present work will fully vindicate me from the imputation ; still it does appear that the Continental Reformers had submitted themselves to the discipline under which God’s Providence had placed them, until their conscience (most ill-directed, I admit, and morally perverse, but still honestly,) seemed to them to command its abandonment.” p. 44. note.

“Now take the case of anti-Roman ‘high-churchmen.’ Their controversy with ‘evangelicals’ turns on the question, whether *self-denial* and a repeated *exercise of the will* be necessary to holy living, or whether the justified possess a principle which will carry them into a good life *by itself*. Our Twelfth Article is as plain as words can make it on the ‘evangelical’ side: (observe in particular the word ‘necessarily’): of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense: but I know no Article which ‘Romanizers’ have to distort so much, as *all* ‘high-churchmen’ have to distort this. Bishop O’Brien in his work on Faith (p. 121—4. 389—396.) argues very powerfully on the Eleventh, Twelfth, and Thirteenth Articles; and ends with thus summing up the matter. There is a ‘Justification, which we have by Faith only, (Art. XI.) which good works *follow*, (Art. XII.) which no good works precede, (Art. XIII.)’ I strongly urge the passages above cited on those, who think that ‘high-churchmen’ can subscribe our Articles, without

violently distorting, and, as I may say, dislocating them. The very phrase 'Justification by Faith only,' invented by Luther for his heresy, is incorporated; nay, Art. XIII seems directly to assert that Cornelius, notwithstanding the angel's address to him, (Acts x. 4.) was no more 'meet to receive grace,' than the most proud and blinded Pharisee. I repeat it: any one who shrinks from this last atrocious and most immoral sentiment, has a far greater difficulty in subscribing Art. XIII. than I have in subscribing the most apparently anti-Roman of the number." p. 479.

"I have endeavoured throughout to speak respectfully and charitably of individuals, but plainly and distinctly of principles. Of two principles especially, which may be considered the distinguishing characteristics of the Reformation, whether here or abroad—I mean the Lutheran Doctrine of Justification, and the principle of private judgment—I have argued (pp. 305. 502—4.) that, in their abstract nature and necessary tendency, they sink below atheism itself. At the same time I have also endeavoured to make it clear, that my intense abhorrence of the Reformation, (whether it be considered just or exaggerated,) at least has its origin in no fanatical antiquarianism, in no perverse blindness to those benefits which are called, in one comprehensive word, civilization." p. 587, 588.

"Lutheranism then is wholly inconsistent with the essential principles of natural religion. Again, considered in its Christian aspect, 'it corrupts,' as I have expressed myself in the *British Critic*, 'the very principle of orthodoxy itself.' For in the first place it leads its victims to fix their gaze on the internal workings of their own minds, instead of the great object of Revelation, as their main stay and encouragement: and in the next place, orthodoxy has neither meaning nor basis, except as the correlative of holy obedi-

ence ; and a theory therefore which disparages the paramount duty of obedience, is equally hostile to the whole fabric of Christian Doctrine. And lastly Lutheranism is also a *specific* heresy ; for it denies the essential dogma of inherent righteousness. I trust then that I have sufficiently explained the meaning of various most severe expressions, which I have used on the subject in the *British Critic* ; explained them at least so far as this, that even those who may continue to dissent from the views I hold, will acknowledge that I used such expressions with a precise and definite meaning, not with inconsiderate and hasty vehemence. Since, however, these expressions have been so often quoted, I think it will be better again to put down on paper the principal among them ; as a proof that I have every desire to repeat, in my own name, the extremely condemnatory language which I have used anonymously." pp. 301, 302.

" ' Evangelicals' . . . cleave to the soul destroying heresy of Luther on the subject of Justification.'<sup>e</sup>

" ' A religious person who shall be sufficiently clear-headed to understand the meaning of words, is warranted in rejecting Lutheranism on the very same grounds which would induce him to reject Atheism ; viz. as being the contradiction of truths, which he feels on most certain grounds to be first principles.'<sup>f</sup>

" ' If it be true that the idea of duty is more deeply rooted in our nature even than that of God (though it is painful to make such comparisons) a serious result follows in regard to Lutheranism. . . . When . . . we speak of Lutheranism, we speak of an abstract Doctrine, which cannot, we verily believe, be held consistently even by the devils ; but which is held to an alarming extent among ' Evangelicals,' though inconsistently. And of this abstract Doctrine we now say, that the considerations in the text shew it to be worse, that is, to be more fundamentally at variance with our higher and better nature, than Atheism itself.'<sup>g</sup>

<sup>e</sup> " ' On the Synagogue and the Church,' p. 63."

<sup>f</sup> " ' On Church Authority,' p. 232."

<sup>g</sup> " ' On Mill's Logic,' p. 406, 407."

“And speaking still of the said abstract Lutheran Doctrine, there is no one circumstance connected with my humble efforts in the *British Critic*, on which I look back with so much satisfaction as on this; that I have ventured to characterize that hateful and fearful type of Antichrist in terms not wholly inadequate to its prodigious demerits.” p. 305.

## VII.

### TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

“Now in the sixteenth century, the Ecclesiastical definition on the Real Presence was rejected by the English Reformers; and the rejection is defended, because some of the Fathers hold language which appears inconsistent with it. Let us conceive as a parallel case, that some small Church, one hundred years (say) after the Nicene Council, when the whole Catholic body had given their joyful witness to the *ὁμοούσιον*, and after that this supposed local Church inclusively had herself received it, should have rejected the word, and thrown off communion with the rest of Christendom because they maintained it. Let us then further conceive, that in justification of so wild and wicked a procedure, they should have drawn attention to the language of several Ante-Nicene Fathers, apparently inconsistent with the Council’s decree; and moreover (which is really a strong fact) to the circumstance, that a local Council of some repute was generally considered to have *condemned* the word *ὁμοούσιον*, as savouring of Sabellianism.<sup>h</sup> What, think we, would have been the general voice of Antiquity, in speaking of that local Church? it is a matter for grave thought.

<sup>h</sup> “The Council of Antioch, towards the end of the third century.”

“I am well aware that it will be said by many in parallel instances (though it cannot be urged in this<sup>1</sup>) that where

<sup>1</sup> “That cannot be said in *this* case, for Mr. Palmer admits (‘On the Church,’ vol. i. p. 211.) that the Greek Church *does* use the word ‘Transubstantiation.’ It seems necessary to add here one or two observations, lest I be supposed in the text to contradict the Articles of our Church. ‘High-churchmen,’ will, I suppose, with one consent agree, that the Doctrine denied by our Church, under the name ‘Transubstantiation,’ is the Doctrine of our Lord’s Body being present after Consecration, in such sort, that if our senses were not miraculously withholden, they would perceive it. But that Doctrine is virtually denied by the Roman formularies, as well as by our own: for according to the scholastic use of the words ‘substance’ and ‘accidents,’ the latter alone *can by possibility* fall under the cognizance of the senses; and it is a ruled point that *they* are *not* changed. The ‘substance,’ in the case of any body whatever, is wholly unknown to us, and its real nature is just as mysterious, without supposing any change, as it will be *with* that supposition. The Catechism of the Council of Trent says, ‘that Christ the Lord *is not in this Sacrament as in a place . . . nor as He is great or small, which belongs to quantity; but as He is a substance.*’ And again, the accidents of the Bread and Wine, after Consecration, ‘beyond all the ordinary course of nature support themselves, and rest on no other thing.’ (De Eucharistia, xlv. xlv.) The substance of a body then, in scholastic language, is that wholly unknown and inconceivable thing, (not inclosed in, or referable to space) which is the ‘substratum’ of ‘accidents,’ or of what we now-a-days call ‘phenomena.’ Nor have I ever been able, by the utmost stretch of my abilities, to understand how English Churchmen, in saying that the ‘bread’ remains, can possibly mean any thing different, from what Roman Catholics mean in saying that the ‘accidents of the bread’ remain.

“It must be fully acknowledged, that one hears of a popular notion in the middle ages, contradictory to this Doctrine; a notion that Christ’s Body in the Eucharist is “carnally pressed” with the teeth; that it is a body or substance of a certain extension and bulk in space, and a certain figure and due disposition of parts.’ How far such a notion may have received more or less countenance from theologians (e. g. Bellarmine,) I am not prepared with an opinion. Such popular notion, however, is plainly that which is condemned in our Twenty-eighth Article; it is one which all members of our Church *do* readily condemn, and which, as I have said, the formularies of the Roman Church are very far indeed from countenancing or supporting.

“I cannot refrain from adding another passage from the ‘Catechism,’ in regard to the accusation so commonly brought against the Roman Doctrine, that it affects to *explain* a mystery; whereas it only affects to do, what the Nicene Doctrine does, *define* a mystery. ‘Let not the faithful too curiously



the Greek Church has given no sanction, there has been no judgment of the Universal Church on the matter; and, therefore, that the case is wholly different. That answer does not, I must say openly, in the very least remove my own deep-seated hatred of the principle in question; but it doubtless makes, in the judgment of English 'high-churchmen,' a plain distinction between the cases; still let it be most carefully observed, that this answer does not even remotely affect the purpose for which I have brought the case forward." pp. 118, 119.

## VIII.

### PURGATORY.

"The following is a valuable account, in short space, of 'mental prayer:' it is taken principally from the works of St. Alphonsus Liguori, and is prefixed to the English translation of his 'Preparation for Death.'" p. 349.

"Let the meditation be closed with a *Pater* and *Ave*, to recommend to God the souls in Purgatory, the Prelates of the Church, all sinners, and all our relatives, friends, and benefactors. We should never omit to pray at the end of our meditation for the holy souls in Purgatory, and for poor sinners.'" p. 356.

enquire how that change can take place: for neither can it be perceived by us, nor have we any example of it, either in natural changes or in the creation of the world itself. But what this is must be known by faith; *how it takes place* must not be too curiously enquired.' (xlii.) After what is here said, I hope that a passage in one of my articles is sufficiently intelligible, which, though not in the number of MR. PALMER'S extracts, I have seen quoted in more than one other quarter as peculiarly objectionable. 'The idea that to a Christian, believing all the astounding mysteries which are contained in the doctrine of the Incarnation, the further belief in the Real Presence, even to the extent of the Tridentine definition, is a serious additional "tax on his credulity," is not tenable for one moment.' 'On Goode, p. 71.' " pp. 118, 119.

## IX.

## INVOCATION OF SAINTS.—RELICS.—IMAGES.—ROSARIES.

“ To be ashamed of devotion to the Blessed Saints, or to the relics of their earthly tabernacles, or to holy images, is to be ashamed of the Cross of Christ, and to lower the standard of high and heavenly philosophy before the supercilious, specious, empty philosophy of the world. For by so doing, we shrink from publicly professing the great Christian truth, that ardent personal love to Christ, whose friends those Saints are, who has dwelt by the agency of the Holy Ghost within those earthly tabernacles, and who is Himself represented in those images, that this ardent personal love for Him is the very centre of all true philosophy, and, as from an eminence, commands all the powers of our intellect and imagination submissively to bend before it and do its bidding.” p. 274.

“ English ‘ high-churchmen ’ are in the constant habit of attributing to the most holy and mortified men, to St. Buonaventure, to St. Bernardine of Sienna, to St. Alphonsus Liguori, a close approach at least to positive idolatry; what more fearful approximation to blasphemy against the Holy Ghost has the wildest German ever devised ? ” pp. 425, 426.

“ But it is the most blasphemous irreverence to think, *on our own responsibility*, that a belief is *idolatrous* which Saints *have* held. I believe that good men in our Church have *inherited* this shocking sentiment, and *not* held it on their own responsibility.” p. 428.

“ And I will say plainly that nothing, in my judgment, would be fraught with more omnigenous mischief, or would deservedly incur God’s heavier displeasure, than any attempt to introduce generally among us at the present time any of those devotions to the Blessed Virgin, which occupy

so prominent a place in foreign Churches. But having said this boldly, I will also say with equal boldness, that this opinion implied no adverse criticism whatever on foreign systems as they exist. On this subject I have really seen no evidence, which enables me to have so much as a bias one way or the other ; nor indeed is it at all practically important that a Member of our Church should have such a bias : we know our own duty, and we need know no more. If indeed some religious and unusually intelligent person were to live for a considerable time, say in some particular part of Italy ; if he were able, by a strong and sustained effort of the imagination, to realize and sympathize with the habitual emotions, desires, aspirations of the people ; if he were to follow them into their retirement and their home, converse familiarly with them, and live almost as one of themselves ; and if, after having done all this, his opinion were unfavourable, it would justly deserve the very greatest attention. But the mere random observations of those who go abroad mainly for recreation, and presume to pass judgment on a nation's religion by such mere external forms as a rapid passage through the country enables them to perceive, can surely have no weight whatever, in the mind of any candid and reasonable inquirer. As to stories they hear, they are still less trustworthy than appearances they see ; for it is well known that Italian guides continually invent false tales against their countrymen, with the view of obtaining better pay from the English traveller.

“ Observe, the question to be considered is this : not whether Roman Catholics address very frequent devotions to St. Mary, (this is allowed on all hands,) but whether those devotions tend to cloud or supersede in their minds the thoughts of their and her Creator ; whether the form, as it were, in which she is habitually present to their imagination, is as kneeling with uplifted hands to her Son,

praying for those favours which they beg from her ; or, on the other hand, as scattering down on them those favours from her own treasury. If the former be the case, every invocation they address to her not only does not put her before their minds in the place of Christ, but imprints more deeply on their conscience and imagination her infinite inferiority to Him. For instance, the Rosary, the use of which is continually thrown in their teeth, would most certainly tend very powerfully to this latter result. It consists in meditation on fifteen mysteries of St. Mary, in all of which, except two, our Blessed Lord himself must be in the mind of those who meditate ; and in almost all of these, must be so in their mind as forcibly to impress it with a sense of her infinite subordination to Him." pp. 81, 82.

"The other subject, of which it appears to me that common fairness requires a notice, is the controversy between Bishop Wiseman and Mr. Palmer on the Intercession and Invocation of Saints. . . .

"But on the controversy in question, I really think that Bishop Wiseman has not received justice. The circumstance that several of his quotations were of very doubtful authority, has made people forget how many remain, of undeniable authenticity, and very cogent in their effect." p. 163.

"Without at all intruding myself into the controversy between Mr. Palmer and his new assailant, which is not yet, I suppose, brought to a close, the following observations of the latter writer are surely too true to admit of any denial :—

"‘Let [any Anglican Clergyman] in a sermon before the most enlightened audience that England can produce, before the Universities, or the very Bench of Bishops, use the expressions which are so

common in the homilies of the Fathers . . . about the intercession of the Saints, their patronage and protection, the veneration due to them and their relics ; let him even guard all these expressions with explanations ; still he will be considered as broaching Doctrines the most unsound and dangerous to the Church.'

"Or, in other words, Doctrines, which widely prevailed throughout Christendom in the fourth and fifth centuries, would not be for a moment tolerated by ordinary English 'high-churchmen' in the nineteenth." p. 165.

"As our own Service is recited in communion with our own Church, the Breviary Service would be of course recited in communion with 'the Holy Church throughout all the world ;' while at the same time each individual would most carefully, *as a matter of the plainest duty*, omit any Invocations or the like, for which his mind is not fully prepared ; or which would have in his case any the most remote tendency to obscure the Vision of the Son of God." p. 458.

## X.

### POPIISH MIRACLES.

"But sufficient justice will not be done the subject, without drawing the attention of learned men in our Church, who protest against Roman practices, to the following long extract from the Dublin Review. The Roman Catholics have been so long challenged to join issue on the question of Antiquity, that they have a right to claim the most careful consideration of their arguments, when they *do* enter upon that field of discussion. It occurs in a criticism on a little work, called, 'A Voice from Rome ;' which, while it displays a remarkable desire to do justice to the Roman system, complains in very severe terms of many

practices which flourish at Rome. The Reviewer thus proceeds:" p. 141, 142.

"In a little work containing the history of the Medal of the B. Virgin, commonly known by the epithet of *miraculous*, there are many extraordinary but well-attested cases of conversion of hardened unbelievers through the prayers of their friends, and the application of that blessed symbol, to the unconscious sinner. These to flesh and blood, to the dull sense and the cold heart of the present generation, are hard to believe, and they are either silently rejected or openly scoffed at—would to God by our adversaries only! For instance, a soldier, we are told, in the military hospital at Paris, is on the point of death, and rejects every succour of religion. In vain the sisters of charity who attend him, in vain the good curate make every effort to bring him to a right feeling on the necessity of making his peace with God. He rejects every offer, and at last with violent oaths and brutal rage, imposes silence on the subject. Reduced to extremity, the pious sisters have recourse to prayer to the B. Virgin, not expecting him to survive the night; and place a medal secretly in his bed. He sleeps tranquilly, and on awaking, mildly sends for the curate, receives the sacrament with great devotion, and dies in peace." This is only one instance out of many.'"<sup>x</sup>

<sup>u</sup> "Notice Historique, sixth ed. p. 76."

<sup>x</sup> "As regards the *doctrine* implied in this extract, which, at first hearing, may perhaps pain the conscience of some, who deserve the tenderest and most considerate dealing, it must be observed, first, that the difficulty is *exactly the same*, when, *by means of intercessory prayer alone*, a sudden conversion is effected; and, secondly, that in neither case is there any real difficulty, because any amount of probation may be crowded (if I may so speak) into the smallest portion of time; e. g. the moment of death may be indefinitely protracted *to the individual*, so as to allow opportunity for God's full trial and justification of the soul. 'He can condense into an hour a life of trial. He who frames the world in a moment, . . . more wondrously can He deal with the world of spirits, who are never subject to the accidents of matter. He can, by one keen pang of agony punish the earthly soul, or *by one temptation justify it*, or by one vision glorify it.' Newman's Parochial Sermons, vol. v. p. 59. [W. G. W.] p. 149."

## XI.

## REVERENCE FOR EPISCOPACY.

“Secondly, is it wrong in me to ‘disregard the authorities of our Church’? This must surely depend on the dicta of those authorities. The Roman Catholics indeed generally say, that Christians are, in matters of doctrine, bound to receive implicitly the decrees of St. Peter’s Chair: but those who so think, think also that, by a Divine promise, that Chair is infallibly saved from teaching error. But to reject the doctrine of the Church’s infallibility as a figment, to proclaim, as a great and glorious truth, that all Bishops are but fallible men, and that the chief Bishop on earth sanctions, nay, practises idolatry; and at the same time to call for implicit deference and submission to the doctrinal statements of a certain small body of Bishops, who are indefinitely at variance with each other, and who, according to Mr. Palmer’s own theory, are separated off from the great body of the Catholic Church; this is a flight of conservative extravagance, an assumption of spiritual despotism, which can find no parallel beyond the circle of Anglican ‘high-churchmen.’ My own sentiments on the subject I have already expressed, and find nothing to alter.” pp. 72, 73.

“Nay, as if it were their wish to bring our Church into contempt, they have talked of appointing our present Bishops visitors of such bodies;” Prelates, of whom surely it is no disrespect to say, that they have not, as a body, displayed in their public language any deep and unquestioning reverence for the doctrines of asceticism and mortification, nor professed any profound and systematic acquaintance with the science of saints. Surely the very dilemma involved, either in proposing such an arrangement, or in projecting an extensive monastic scheme without it, should

shew how little prepared our Church is at present for such a sudden development." p. 435.

## XII.

### SUBSCRIPTION TO THE ARTICLES.

" That the phrase ' teaching of the Prayer-book ' conveys a definite and important meaning, I do not deny ; considering that it is mainly a selection from the Breviary, it is not surprising that the Prayer-book should on the whole breathe an uniform, most edifying, deeply orthodox spirit ; a spirit which corresponds to one particular body of doctrine, and not to its contradictory. Again, that the phrase ' teaching of the Articles ' conveys a definite meaning, I cannot deny ; for (excepting the five first, which belong to the old theology) they also breathe an uniform, intelligible spirit. But then these respective spirits are not different merely, but absolutely contradictory ; as well could a student in the heathen schools have imbibed at once the Stoic and the Epicurean philosophies, as could a humble member of our Church at the present time learn his creed both from Prayer-book and Articles. This I set out at length, in two pamphlets with an appendix, which I published three years ago ; and it cannot therefore be necessary to go again over the same ground : though something must be added, occasionally in notes, and more methodically in a future chapter. The manner in which the dry wording of the Articles can be divorced from their natural spirit, and accepted by an orthodox believer ; how their *primâ facie* meaning is evaded, and the artifice of their inventors thrown back in recoil on themselves ; this, and the arguments which prove the honesty of this, have now been for some time before the public." pp. 68, 69.

" But even were the formularies of our Church accordant



instead of discordant, urgent instead of wavering, definite instead of vague, still so long as her practical teaching is in the highest degree uncertain, conflicting, and contradictory; when members of our Church seem hardly to agree in one matter of positive opinion that can be named, except the purity of our Church; and when, even as to that, each party maintains that our Church would be most *impure* if she taught Doctrines, which the other party strenuously contends she *does* teach; I can see no possible defence for the position, 'that her Formularies, in their *primâ facie* bearing, demand implicit reception from her children.'" p. 70.

"Again, recent investigations have proved, certainly to my own complete satisfaction, that subscription to the Articles is really very far from a stringent test; but, in the first place, that does not alter the principle, and, in the second place, those with whom I am now in controversy, do not at all admit those methods of interpretation, which give the Articles so extraordinary a latitude." p. 112.

"I am firmly convinced that no one clergyman of our Church, who will look honestly in the face the formularies which he is called on to subscribe, will be able to subscribe them *all* in a *natural* and *straightforward* sense. I attribute this fact to the utter want of fixed religious principles displayed by the leading Reformers; and I attribute to it much of the disingenuous and unmanly spirit, which has so often been the shame of religious controversy in our Reformed Church. But how those who look on the leading Reformers as serious men, as having been zealous for Doctrine, and as having realized their religious expressions, how *these* can subscribe our formularies, it is for themselves to consider." p. 481.

"As this process went on, our formularies also assumed

a new aspect, and it was at last discovered how utterly lax and inoperative our Articles really are. No secret has been made of this conviction. It is now three years since I, a Clergyman of the English Church, writing in my own name, published an opinion, 'that the Articles were not directed against those who *retained the old Doctrines*, so that they were willing to join in a protest against the shameful corruptions in existence, and also to give up the Pope,' (Few More Words, pp. 34, 35.) that 'the Articles do not exclude' the opinions which '*had existed*' (at the time of the Reformation) '*in the Church for an indefinite period.*' (Appendix to do. p. 8.) No argument has appeared of any force against these positions; and, what is more to the purpose, no condemnation of them by any authoritative tribunal. Three years have passed, since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles I renounce no one Roman Doctrine: yet I retain my Fellowship which I hold on the tenure of subscription, and have received no Ecclesiastical censure in any shape. It may be said, indeed, that individual Bishops have spoken against those opinions: but where does the Institution of our Church give individual Bishops any power of authoritatively declaring Church-of-England Doctrine?" pp. 567, 568.

See also under Sec. VI.

### III.

## CONDUCT OF MR. WARD BEFORE THE HEBDOMADAL BOARD, COMPARED WITH THAT OF LUTHER BEFORE THE DIET OF WORMS.

---

*"Alas! I found, in Luther's Commentary, no such points of sympathy and agreement as I hoped. Never was my conscience so shocked and revolted by any work, not openly professing immorality. . . . The Extracts alone, with which one meets, whether in Moehler or elsewhere, are quite sufficient to justify all that I have ever published in his individual disparagement. . . . Well was it for Luther that he had enjoyed the unspeakable blessings of a Catholic education and monastic discipline, and so had learnt in some slight measure the real sinfulness and evil of sin, before he turned his mind to the invention of these blasphemies."*—WARD'S "Ideal of a Christian Church," pp. 169, 171.

---

#### WARD.

"I was summoned on Saturday, not as before a tribunal which claimed the power of authoritatively putting questions, but merely that I might have the opportunity, if I so wished, of disavowing certain opinions, previously to the Hebdomadal Board proceeding further against me.

"The questions I was asked accordingly were these:—

"1st. Whether I wished to disavow the authorship of the above-mentioned Work, *which bears my name in its title-page*;

"2ndly. Whether I wished to disavow the sentiments contained in certain propositions, selected from it, which were then read to me."

#### LUTHER.

"On his appearance before that august assembly, he was directed to be silent till questions should be put to him. The Official of the Archbishop of Treves, who was the Emperor's speaker on the occasion, then produced a bundle of books, and informed Luther that, by order of his Imperial Majesty, he was directed to propose two questions to him.

"The 1st was, Whether he acknowledged those books *which went by his name* to be his own;

"The 2nd, Whether he intended to defend or to retract what was contained in them?

"The Official then read over the titles in succession."

. . . . .

WARD.

"My answer was, that in a matter *so important to myself*, I wished to take no step whatever without the advantage of consulting with my friends, and taking, if necessary, legal advice ;

"Accordingly I asked to postpone my answer until to-day.

"You replied that nothing could be more reasonable than such a request, and kindly suggested that *even a later day* might be preferable ; an offer, however, of which I did not wish to avail myself.

"On appearing before you to-day, I stated, that, acting under legal advice, I must decline answering *any questions whatever (sic)* ; until I should know more definitely the course which it was intended to adopt against me.

LUTHER.

Having instantly replied to the First question in the affirmative, Luther proceeded, "Because this" (the Second) "*question relates to Faith and the Salvation of souls, and because it concerns the Word of God, the most important of all objects* in heaven and in earth, and which deservedly requires of us all the most profound reverence, it would be equally rash and dangerous for me to give a sudden answer to such a question ; since, without previous deliberation, I might assert less than the subject demands, and more than truth would admit ; which would both expose me to condemnation from that sentence of Christ, 'Whosoever denieth me before men, him will I deny before my Father which is in heaven.'

"*For this reason* I humbly beseech your Imperial Majesty to grant me a competent time for consideration, that I may satisfy the inquiry without injuring the Word of God, and without endangering my own soul."

"After some deliberation, he was allowed to defer his answer till *the next day*:" . . . . . though "he was told that he ought not to have petitioned for delay, because he had well known for a long time, what would be the nature of his examination."

"On the following day . . . Luther rose and spoke before the Emperor and the Princes, in the German language, to the following effect . . . . .

"To the 1st question, I gave a plain and direct answer ; and in that I shall persist for ever. I did publish those books, and I am responsible for their contents . .

In regard to the second question . . . . my answer shall be direct and plain, . . . unless I am con-

WARD.

"From this statement, it will appear, I think, that I have adopted no unworthy subterfuge, but rather proceeded on the acknowledged principles of justice.

"Whenever I am authoritatively informed of the *whole (sic)* method of proceeding which it is intended to pursue against me, there shall be no want of perfect openness on my side also; but nothing surely could be more unreasonable, than to expect that, so long as strict *secrecy (sic)* is preserved on that head, I should volunteer any statement, however unimportant, or make any admission, however apparently insignificant.

LUTHER.

vinced by Scripture, or clear reasons, my belief is so confirmed by the Scriptural passages I have produced, and my conscience so determined to abide by the Word of God, that I neither can nor will retract any thing; for it is neither safe nor innocent to act against a man's conscience.'

"Luther then pronounced these words in the German language: **Die stehe ich. Ich kan nicht anders. Got helff mir. Amen.**—'Here I stand. I cannot do otherwise. May God help me. Amen.'"

On the 19th of March, 1521, Luther wrote as follows to Spalatinus:

"I see most distinctly these bloody-minded men will never rest till *they have taken away my life.*" Again: "I hear the Emperor has published a mandate to frighten me. But Christ, nevertheless, lives; and I will enter Worms, though all the gates of Hell and all the powers of darkness oppose."

"The hearts of Luther's best friends began to fail them as the danger approached. At Oppenheim, near Worms, they solicited him, in the most vehement manner, to venture no further. . . . It was in his power, as yet, to have turned aside from the road to Worms, and sheltered himself from the fury of the Papists. . . . It was under such circumstances and to such solicitations, that . . . he returned the ever-memorable answer:

"That, though he should be obliged to encounter at Worms as many devils as there were tiles upon the houses of that city, this would not deter him from his fixed purpose of appearing there:

WARD.

"I should not do justice to my own feelings if I did not conclude by expressing my strong sense of the courtesy with which I was treated on each occasion of appearing before you."

\* \* \* See *Ward's Letter to the Vice-Chancellor*, Dec. 3, 1844.

LUTHER.

that these fears of his friends could only arise from the suggestions of Satan, who apprehended the approaching ruin of his kingdom, by the Confession of the Truth before such a grand assembly as the Diet of Worms.'"

"Luther was now deemed a detestable and excommunicated heretic, to whom no kindness or respectful consideration could be shewn."

\* \* \* See *Milner's History of the Church of Christ*. Vol. IV., Chap. VI. pp. 542-554.

P.S. When the publication of the Resolutions of the Hebdomadal Board had taken place, and proceedings had actually commenced upon what he must have well known to be *legal* ground of reputed authorship—then, at the eleventh hour, Mr. Ward attempted to make a virtue of necessity, and, in a Second Letter to the Vice-Chancellor, avowed himself the writer of the Ideal Church: alleging in defence of his previous reserve, the course pursued, last year, in the case of Dr. Pusey, though he must have known that the Statute affecting Dr. Pusey had no relation whatever to his own, and must also have been aware that he was reviving misrepresentations which had been repeatedly and distinctly refuted.

#### IV.

### RESOLUTIONS OF THE HEBDOMADAL BOARD, IN THE CASE OF MR. WARD'S "IDEAL OF A CHRISTIAN CHURCH CONSIDERED, ETC."

DEC. 13, 1844.

---

“ ‘The sense of the imposers’ can only mean, ‘*the sense in which they intended to allow subscription:*’ plain and obvious, where the words of the Formulary admit but of one interpretation: in other cases, doubtful at first reading, yet *capable of being fixed with any degree of certainty*, by comparison of different passages; by the declarations of the parties; or, *as in the case now supposed*,” (proposed) “*by AN AUTHORITATIVE RULE OF EXPOSITION SUPERADDED TO THE ORIGINAL FORMULA.*”—KEBLE’S *Letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge*.<sup>a</sup>

---

WHEREAS, it is notoriously reputed and believed throughout this University, that a book entitled “*The Ideal of a Christian Church considered*,” has recently been published in Oxford by the REV. WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, M.A.; in which book are contained the following passages: viz.

P. 45, (note). “I know no single movement in the Church except Arianism in the fourth century, which seems to me so wholly destitute of all claims on our sympathy and regard, as the English Reformation.”

P. 473. “For my own part I think it would not be right to conceal, indeed I am anxious openly to express, my own most firm and undoubting conviction,—that were we, as a Church, to pursue such a line of conduct as has been here sketched, in proportion as we did so, we should be taught from above to discern and appreciate the plain marks of Divine Wisdom and authority in the Roman

---

<sup>a</sup> See also the Extracts which precede and follow this quotation, at pp. 22—25, *supra*.

Church, to repent in sorrow and bitterness of heart our great sin in deserting her communion, and to sue humbly at her feet for pardon and restoration."

- P. 68. "That the phrase 'teaching of the Prayer-book' conveys a definite and important meaning, I do not deny; considering that it is mainly a selection from the Breviary, it is not surprising that the Prayer-book should, on the whole, breathe an uniform, most edifying, deeply orthodox, spirit; a spirit which corresponds to one particular body of doctrine, and not to its contradictory. Again, that the phrase 'teaching of the Articles' conveys a definite meaning, I cannot deny; for (excepting the five first, which belong to the old theology) they also breathe an uniform intelligible spirit. But then these respective spirits are not different merely, but absolutely contradictory; as well could a student in the heathen schools have imbibed at once the Stoic and the Epicurean philosophies, as could a humble member of our Church at the present time learn his creed both from Prayer-book and Articles. This I set out at length in two pamphlets with an appendix, which I published three years ago; and it cannot therefore be necessary to go again over the same ground; though something must be added, occasionally in notes, and more methodically in a future chapter. The manner in which the dry wording of the Articles can be divorced from their natural spirit, and accepted by an orthodox believer; how their *primâ facie* meaning is evaded, and the artifice of their inventors thrown back in recoil on themselves; this, and the arguments which prove the honesty of this, have now been for some time before the public."
- P. 100, (note). "In my pamphlets, three years since, I distinctly charged the Reformers with fully tolerating the absence from the Articles of any *real* anti-Roman determination, so only they were allowed to preserve an *apparent* one: a charge which I here beg as distinctly to repeat."
- P. 479. "Our twelfth Article is as plain as words can make it, on the 'evangelical' side: (observe in particular the word 'necessarily'): of course I think its natural meaning may be explained away, for I subscribe it myself in a non-natural sense."
- P. 565. "We find, oh most joyful, most wonderful, most unexpected sight; we find the whole cycle of Roman Doctrine gradually possessing numbers of English Churchmen."
- P. 567. "Three years have passed since I said plainly, that in subscribing the Articles, I renounce no one Roman Doctrine."



AND WHEREAS the said WILLIAM GEORGE WARD, before the publication of the said book, was admitted to the respective degrees of B.A. and M.A. of this University, on the faith of the following Declaration; which Declaration was made and subscribed by him before and in order to his being admitted to each of the said degrees; that is to say:—"I allow the Book of Articles of Religion agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces, and the whole clergy in the Convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord God one thousand five hundred sixty and two; and I acknowledge all and every the Articles therein contained, being in number nine and thirty, besides the ratification, to be agreeable to the Word of God:"

AND WHEREAS the said passages of the said book appear to be inconsistent with the said Articles, and with the said Declaration, and with the good faith of him, the said WILLIAM GEORGE WARD in making and subscribing the same:

In a CONVOCATION to be holden on THURSDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF FEBRUARY NEXT, AT ONE O'CLOCK, the foregoing passages from the said book will be read, and the following Proposition will be submitted to the House:—

*That the passages now read from the book entitled "The Ideal of a Christian Church considered," are utterly inconsistent with the Articles of Religion of the Church of England, and with the Declaration in respect of those Articles made and subscribed by WILLIAM GEORGE WARD previously and in order to his being admitted to the degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively, and with the good faith of him, the said WILLIAM GEORGE WARD in respect of such Declaration and Subscription.*

Before the question "Placetne, &c." is put, the Vice-Chancellor will give Mr. Ward an opportunity of answering

to the charge of having published such passages so inconsistent as aforesaid.

If this Proposition is affirmed the following Proposition will be submitted to the House :

*That the said WILLIAM GEORGE WARD has disentitled himself to the rights and privileges [conveyed by the said degrees, and is hereby degraded from the said degrees of B.A. and M.A. respectively.*

Before the question “Placetne, &c.” is put, the Vice-Chancellor will give Mr. Ward an opportunity of stating any grounds he may have for shewing that he should not be degraded.

IN THE SAME CONVOCATION the following altered form of Statute, which will be promulgated in Congregation on Monday, the 10th day of February next, at Ten o’Clock, will be submitted to the House.

#### TITULUS XVII.—SECT. III.

##### § 2. DE AUCTORITATE ET OFFICIO VICE-CANCELLARII.

###### 1. After the words,

“ — Et ut Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et quoscunque alios minus recte de fide Catholica, et Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sentientes, procul a finibus Universitatis amandandos curet.

“ Quem in finem, quo quisque modo erga Doctrinam vel Disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ affectus sit, Subscriptionis criterio explorandi ipsi jus ac potestas esto”—

it will be proposed to insert the following :

*Quoniam vero Articulos illos Fidei et Religionis, in quibus male-sanæ opiniones, et præsertim Romanensium errores, reprehenduntur, ita nonnulli perperam interpretati sunt, ut erroribus istis vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur, nemini posthac, qui coram Vice-Cancellario, utpote minus recte de Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sentiens, conveniatur, Articulis subscribere fas sit, nisi prius Declarationi subscripserit sub hac forma :*

*Ego A. B. Articulis Fidei et Religionis, necnon tribus Articulis in Canone xxxvi°. comprehensis subscripturus, profiteor, fide mea data huic Universitati, me Articulis istis omnibus et singulis eo sensu subscripturum, in quo eos ex animo credo et primitus editos esse, et nunc*

*mihi ab Universitate propositos tanquam opinionum mearum certum ac indubitatum signum.*

Also in the next sentence of the existing Statute, beginning “Quod si quis S. Ordinibus initiatus,” before the words, “subscribere a Vice-Cancellario requisitus,”

to insert the following words,

*una cum Declaratione supra-recitata.*

2. It will also be proposed in the said sentence to omit the words, “*S. Ordinibus initiatus.*”

Should these alterations be approved, that part of the Statute Tit. XVII. Sect. III. § 2. DE AUCTORITATE ET OFFICIO VICE-CANCELLARII, which will be affected by them, will stand as follows :

— Et ut Hæreticos, Schismaticos, et quoscunque alios minus recte de fide Catholicæ et Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, sentientes, procul a finibus Universitatis amandandos curet.

Quem in finem, quo quisque modo erga Doctrinam vel Disciplinam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ affectus sit, Subscriptionis criterio explorandi ipsi jus ac potestas esto. *Quoniam vero Articulos illos Fidei et Religionis, in quibus male-sanæ opiniones, et præsertim Romanensium errores, reprehenduntur, ita nonnulli perperam interpretati sunt, ut erroribus istis vix aut ne vix quidem adversari videantur, nemini post-hac, qui coram Vice-Cancellario, utpote minus recte de Doctrina vel Disciplina Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ sentiens, conveniatur, Articulis subscribere fas sit, nisi prius Declarationi subscripserit sub hac forma :*

*Ego A. B. Articulis Fidei et Religionis necnon tribus Articulis in Canone xxxvi°. comprehensis subscripturus, profiteor, fide mea data huic Universitati, me Articulis istis omnibus et singulis eo sensu subscripturum, in quo eos ex animo credo et primitus editos esse, et nunc mihi ab Universitate propositos tanquam opinionum mearum certum ac indubitatum signum.*

Quod si quis (sive Præfectus Domus cujusvis, sive alius quis) Articulis Fidei et Religionis, a Synodo Londini A.D. 1562 editis et confirmatis: necnon tribus Articulis comprehensis Canone xxxvi°. Libri Constitutionum ac Canonum Ecclesiasticorum, editi in Synodo Londini cœpta A.D. 1603, *una cum Declaratione supra-recitata*, subscribere a Vice-Cancellario requisitus ter abnuerit seu recusaverit, ipso facto ab Universitate exterminetur et banniat.

B. P. SYMONS,

Vice-Chancellor.

*Also by the same Author,*

I.

RESIGNATION AND LAY COMMUNION: PROFESSOR KEBLE'S  
VIEW of the Position and Duties of the TRACTARIANS, as described in  
his LETTER TO THE HON. MR. JUSTICE COLERIDGE. 1s.

II.

PREACHING: ITS WARRANT, SUBJECT, AND EF-  
FECTS; Considered with reference to "THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES."  
In Two SERMONS, published at the request of the Mayor, Aldermen,  
and Councillors of the City of Oxford: and A SERMON preached before  
the University at St. Mary's. With an APPENDIX. 5s. 6d.

III.

"IS THERE NOT A CAUSE?" A LETTER to the Rev. E. B.  
PUSEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church,  
Oxford. 1s.

IV.

"HORÆ CANONICÆ:" The Liturgy as it is, or The Liturgy as it  
was? A SECOND LETTER to Dr. PUSEY. 1s.

V.

THE TRACTS FOR THE TIMES CONTINUED. A LETTER  
to the HONORABLE AND RIGHT REVEREND THE LORD BISHOP OF  
OXFORD. 1s.

VI.

THE GRIEVANCE OF CHURCH RATES: A LETTER to  
PHILIP PUSEY, Esq., M.P. In which the arguments of the Abolitionists  
are examined, their misrepresentations exposed, and their conduct towards  
the Establishment compared with that of honest and conscientious Dis-  
senters. With an APPENDIX; containing a correspondence between the  
Author and Dr. Bennett, of Silver Street Chapel, Cheapside, upon the  
desecration of the Lord's Supper, and the "sin committed" by the mem-  
bers of the Establishment in the "affair" of Church-rates, &c.—8vo,  
pp. 72. 1s.

VII.

A WORD TO HIS PARISHIONERS, on their Duty to the Church,  
with reference to the Church-rate question.—8vo, pp. 16.



